# The Forum.

DECEMBER, 1891.

## DEGRADATION BY PENSIONS—THE PROTEST OF LOYAL VOLUNTEERS.

No question is more pregnant with issues of vital importance to the people of this country than is this. It is a question that cannot be discussed with freedom by the leaders of opinion in either political party, by men who did not serve in the army or navy, by the new generation who have inherited the results of the war for the preservation of the Union, nor even by those who served in the army or navy, but who were fortunate enough to escape being wounded, or suffering from disease. So deeply seated is the desire to honor and rightly reward those who have suffered in the service of their country, that all of the above classes of citizens instinctively feel a delicacy in taking a position on the subject of pension legislation, which will give an excuse to any man who has suffered, to point to them and say, "You are not with us because you are not of us. We have suffered in the service of our country, you have not: you are ungrateful." No better proof can be found of the innate desire to be grateful than the palsy the fear of such a charge has produced on those who know that the pension legislation of the present day is a national disgrace. No better proof need be given of the fact that there are unworthy men who have taken, and are ever ready to take, all the money they can filch from the National Treasury, than the taunts that have been the universal experience of all who point out any feature of the dishonorable scramble for pensions, and demand a revision of the laws in conformity with the true requirements of honor and justice. Only those may speak with freedom and by authority on this subject, in whose name and for whose benefit pension laws have been enacted. It is for

Copyright, 1890, by the Forum Publishing Company.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them to show in what way honorable expressions of gratitude may be honorably enjoyed.

I have earned the right to speak. I stood in the ranks, a loyal volunteer, in 1861, and heard the hissing balls when the first guns were fired at the skirmish of Blackburns Ford, three days before the first battle of Bull Run. I marched with my company at the last grand review at Washington, in 1865. I lost not a day from service between those dates, except when disabled by a wound received at the battle of Fair Oaks. No man can say of me that I am not with those who demand pensions for loyal service, because I did not serve or did not suffer. I have written my record with my blood. I am not with the mercenary horde who demand pensions for duty done, because my loyalty is not, and never was, for sale.

Did loyal citizens volunteer for pay? Loyal volunteers of 1861–65, who of you will now acknowledge that when, before God and your countrymen, you dedicated your life and sacred honor to the defence of the nation, you then did so for pay? Did you at that time volunteer to defend the old flag at the rate of thirteen dollars per month, or for any other mercenary consideration, either present or prospective? If you did, you have no right to pose as loyal defenders of your country, or to share the gratitude of the nation. You are mercenaries. You have your price: let it be paid, and your names be stricken from the roll of honorable men. Such as you have disgraced the old flag with a stain that traitors' hands had no power to place upon it. Do you not know that loyalty, honor, and honesty are qualities of character that cannot be bought or sold? He who offers to sell them advertises to the world that he does not possess them. When a nation is compelled to pay its citizens for being loyal, there is no loyalty. The good name, the future prosperity and greatness, of our country, are in peril from the degradation of loyalty, honor, and honesty, that is the necessary result of the pension legislation, enacted under the plea that it was a reward to loyal citizen soldiers for their service. What! Pay loyal volunteers for having done their duty? I know that those who stood beside me at the beginning, at the finish, and all through the years of strife, were not there for pay. My company carried the colors at the battle of Fair Oaks, and I stood next the color-guard. In defending the old flag on that day, fourteen out of sixteen comrades fell with bleeding wounds; but the flag did not fall. I know that those who mingled their blood with my own were not there for pay.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What would be a just basis for pensions? It is the duty of those who express gratitude, so to form their action that it may be accepted with honor by the beneficiary. It is creditable to loyal citizens to assume that they volunteered to defend their government because it was their duty so to do, because they loved its institutions, because they were determined that "a government of the people, by the people, for the people, should not perish." It was the duty of every citizen to be loyal and to serve the country in the way he best could. If some were true while others were false, if some did their duty while others staid at home to accumulate wealth from the opportunities of the war, do not tarnish the lustre of the true and noble by offering to pay them for being true, even though, to raise the money for such a purpose, a tax is levied on the vanquished and the stay-at-homes. The good of society demands that honor shall be levelled up, not graded down. It is a law of nature that all men shall earn their own living. Every quality of character that tends to make men industrious, thrifty, true, and noble, is strengthened by compliance with this law. That man is most valuable to himself and to society who complies with the requirements of this law most cheerfully and with greatest intelligence. All honorable men will say instinctively that a man who is not willing to render a valuable service in fair exchange for the means of a comfortable support, when such opportunity is offered him, is unworthy of respect, and not entitled to sympathy. He is a self-made pauper. That law of nature which requires all men to earn their own living, entitles every man to as good a living as he can obtain by virtue of his own strength, intelligence, and economy, with a just regard for the rights of others. If, in the service of his country, a man sustains an impairment of his earning capacity, it is the duty of society so to care for him that such loss shall not cause him to suffer. It does not necessarily follow that for such a loss the man must become a pensioner. It should be the first duty of society to recognize not only its obligation to the man, but the man's respect for himself. Instead of placing him on the pension-roll, an effort should be made to find for him some honorable occupation, public or private, in which he can render valuable service, for which he will receive full pay. That man does not live, whose character is braced by a true sense of honor, who would not infinitely prefer to have such a position, and maintain his independence and self-respect, rather than to receive the same income without giving an equivalent for it. In forming the legislation of the country, the clamoring of the dishonor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able should not be considered. When the pension-roll is relieved of all those who are not in need, and all who are willing to earn a living if a fitting opportunity is found for them, those that remain will be only the very few who can, under the most favorable circumstances that can be found for them, earn only partly enough to support themselves in comfort; those who can do nothing towards their own support; and those who can earn nothing, and who periodically require the aid and attendance of other persons. To each of these classes abundance should be given. No honorable person will for an instant withhold from such as they the full sympathy and support which are their due. When the pension-roll has been so sifted, some dregs may be left,—moral and physical wrecks who have reached the lowest depths of degradation, and are unworthy of consideration, except as paupers. These must be cared for, but their names should be put on a paupers' roll, so that by no association or implication can their status cast dishonor on loyal volunteers.

What is the present basis for pensions? The Act of June 27, 1890, requires, in case of a soldier:—

"(1) An honorable discharge. [But the certificate need not be filed unless called for.]

"(2) A minimum service of ninety days.

"(3) A mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not due to vicious habits. [It need not have originated in the service.]

"(4) The rates under the act are graded from $6 to $12, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and are not affected by the rank held.

"(5) A pensioner under prior laws may apply under this one, or a pensioner under this one may apply under other laws, but he cannot draw more than one pension for the same period."

The above is copied from the rules issued by the Pension Office. In the form provided, the claimant is required to make oath that he is "unable to earn a support by manual labor, by reason of disease or injuries," which he names; and his witnesses swear that they have reason to believe that the claimant is "the identical person he represents himself to be," and that they have "no interest in the claim." They do not swear that they believe the claimant to be unable to earn a support.

As though it was feared that those who volunteered to serve their country would not volunteer to accept the bribe thus offered them, sixty thousand pension attorneys have been commissioned, about twenty thousand of whom are in active practice, to hunt up the old soldiers, and coax, urge, and tempt them to make oath that they are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"unable to earn a support by manual labor." For this work of corrupting the loyalty, honor, and honesty of the "Boys in Blue," the government offers a reward to the pension attorney of ten dollars each. These pension attorneys are re-enforced by senators and representatives in Congress, who in one year have made 154,817 requests on the commissioner of pensions for "the condition of claims." Under such conditions, the country need not be astounded at the figures given by the commissioner of pensions in his official report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of pensions in force | 676,160 |
| Number of claimants not on rolls | 559,027 |
| Number of persons pensioned, or seeking to be pensioned | 1,235,187 |
| Number of claims pending, including original claimants, claims for increase, and duplicate claims | 928,473 |
| Number of rejected claims in files | 146,536 |
| Total number of claims requiring attention | 1,075,009 |

In addition to the pension attorneys, senators, and representatives, the commissioner of pensions has under his supervision a force of 6,246 subordinates. This organization was successful during the year in adding 138,216 pensioners to the rolls, and disbursing "on account of pensions, expenses, etc., $118,548,959.71, and leaving 38,574 pensioners on the roll, who remained unpaid for want of time, and who were entitled to receive $4,883,242.64." This will make the total payment for the year $123,432,202.35.

It is estimated that the organization is now so well disciplined and the work so well in hand, that 350,000 claims can be allowed during the fiscal year to end June 30, 1892, and that $133,473,085 can be distributed. The influence of the Act of June 27, 1890, is seen in the fact that 114,757 pensioners were added to the rolls, and 482,181 claims were placed on file, in one year under that act; making a total of 596,938 claims, which, at $10 each, show the pension attorneys' interest realized from the passage of that law to be $5,969,380. Amount paid as fees to attorneys during the year, $2,769,200.70.

The growth of the industry of corruption—the industry of procuring claims to prosecute against the government, in the name of its beneficiaries who should receive the full amount paid by the government on their account, not as a collection forced by process of law, but as a cordial recognition of honorable service—is strikingly illustrated by the fact that in 1890 but 66,637 claims were allowed, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now the promise is made that 350,000 claims may be allowed in 1892. Is it not time that honorable men should band themselves together to destroy this industry of corruption? We are told that there are "688,549 survivors who are not pensioned, and 879,908 deceased soldiers not represented on the pension-rolls." If this industry of corruption be not destroyed, the pension-roll may be increased by 1,568,457 pensioners, making the total number 2,244,617. This number of pensions, at the average annual value of those in force June 30, 1891 ($131.99), will enable the organized force of the Pension Office and its agencies—with the aid of pension attorneys, senators, and representatives—to distribute $296,266,997.83 per year. The pension attorneys are offered $15,684,570 to increase the burden of the people to this enormous amount. Is it conceivable that they will allow this profitable industry to be easily destroyed? Is it surprising that one of their number has said that those who undertake to do it will have a hundred million dollars of boodle against them? But if they have loyalty, honor, truth, and justice with them, why should they fail?

The way in which loyal volunteers are disgraced. Out of 520,158 pensioners of the war of 1861, 402,349 received twelve dollars or less per month. There are but 3,161 drawing the full disability pension of seventy-two dollars per month. This shows conclusively that the really disabled are very few in number, and that the appalling aggregate is made up of those who have been bribed by their part of the boodle to make claims on which pension attorneys can collect fees. The enormous aggregate of such claims robs the deserving disabled of all hope of receiving a proper support. This state of affairs has been brought about by designing persons who have stolen the livery of the "Boys in Blue" in which to serve their own selfish ends. They have taken care to have the laws so formed as to make the largest possible number of persons eligible to pensions. To accomplish this it became necessary to break down every barrier for the protection of the honest claimant. That there might be many fees, it was necessary that there should be many claimants. That there might be many claimants, every sort of sham patriot who enlisted for what he could get, and is now working the pension scheme for what he can make out of it, is placed on the rolls as the peer of the volunteer of 1861, who entered the army at the start, and stood by his colors until the finish. Is not this disgrace deep dyed?

The commissioner of pensions, in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, states that there are about 1,208,707 soldiers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Union now living, and of these survivors, 520,158 are now on the pension-rolls; and that 384,551 original invalid claims are pending, of survivors who are not on the pension-rolls; making a total of 904,709 soldiers who are receiving, or attempting to procure, pensions. This statement proclaims to the world, that, out of 1,208,707 living soldiers, only 303,998 are now able to earn a respectable living. Who believes this to be true? If it is not true, it is the most damaging defamation of character to which honorable men have ever been called to submit. It should be resented as an insult to the intelligence and honor of loyal volunteers. This disgraceful record must be wiped out. It startles the world with the statement that two-thirds of the living men who had the courage, intelligence, and energy to conquer the Rebellion, are now so lost to honor, so devoid of good character, so ignorant and shiftless, that they cannot earn an honest living, and are clamoring for a pittance which would speedily starve them to death if the statement were true. If any of the 904,709 soldiers who have obtained pensions, or are seeking to obtain them, are capable of earning a respectable living, is there any honest reason why they should not do so? If not willing, why should their names be allowed a place on a roll with honorable men? Let the pension-roll be a roll of honor. If the country must support the dishonorable, let their names appear on a roll of paupers.

The volunteer armies contained the best brain and blood of the nation. Why should they now be measured by the standard of manual labor? I can honestly make oath that I am "unable to earn a support by manual labor" by reason of a gunshot wound in my right lung, received while defending the old flag at the battle of Fair Oaks. That does not prove that I am unable to earn a respectable living. My army experience has increased, not decreased, my earning capacity. My employment is intellectual, and my pay is now six dollars per day. My pension is ten dollars per month. When I accepted my pension as an honorable expression of the nation's gratitude and appreciation, it was rated at four dollars per month. Every time I reported for the biennial examination then required, I was advised to go to a pension attorney, and apply for an increase. The allowance was raised first to six dollars, then to eight dollars, and finally to ten dollars, per month, where it has stood for years. My health has been almost perfect ever since my muster out of service. By working days, and studying evenings, I have fairly overcome the disadvantages of defective education caused by my army service. My acquaintance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with my comrades, and my observation of the men wearing army buttons that I see daily, teach me that mine is no exceptional case. In fact I believe the reverse to be true. Why should I, and others similarly or better circumstanced, be rated for disability to earn a support by manual labor?

When the pension question first began to show evil tendencies, it attracted my close attention. As act followed act, deepening the conspiracy against the Treasury of the government, and the loyalty, honor, and honesty of the loyal volunteers, my mind became excited on the subject. Three years ago, I wrote a paper under the title of "The Duty and Reward of Loyalty," in which I took substantially the ground here expressed. That paper was read by a number of comrades who had served in the ranks, some of whom had sustained wounds, and are drawing pensions, as I am doing. So far as I am informed, it was never read by such a man who did not give it his cordial approval, and signify his entire willingness to surrender his pension if the laws could be reformed on the lines therein indicated. Finally I read the paper publicly on the evening of July 4, 1891, to a few comrades at Takoma Park, D.C., with a distinct understanding, that, in case it should lead to a demand for a movement to carry into effect the policy advocated, others, not myself, would take the lead. Such a demand has come, and I find it impossible to separate myself from the work of the movement, therefore I am actively identified with the Society of Loyal Volunteers, organized—

"To teach that the duty of loyalty demands that each citizen should faithfully perform the duties of a volunteer soldier in times of war and the duties of a citizen in times of peace.

"To secure the enactment of just laws, and their equitable administration, for the assistance, care, and maintenance of all loyal citizens who are in need, by reason of their loss of earning capacity incurred in the performance of their duty during the war for the preservation of the Union." *

To say that I was mistaken yesterday is to say that I am better informed to-day. My pension is perfectly legal. It required long and close thinking for me to see clearly that what is legal may be neither honorable nor honest. My own experience teaches me that thousands who have given little or no thought to this point will agree with me when their attention is called to it. When they understand it rightly, their action will be prompt and true. At heart I believe the average citizen to be loyal, honorable, and honest. If his actions

* Constitution of Society of Loyal Volunteers, Art. II., Sects. 1, 2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do not always conform to high standards of ethical requirements, it is because his mind has not been sufficiently aroused to cause him to do his own thinking on the subject.

I am of the opinion that a close canvass of all loyal volunteers will result in securing the active support of at least a hundred thousand real veterans for such a reform of the pension laws as will change the legal basis of the claim from "support by manual labor" to *impairment of earning capacity*, and, further, provide that no claimant shall receive payments when not in need or while earning a comfortable living by public or private employment. More than this, I believe that, when the reasons for and the nature of the reform demanded are once properly understood, large numbers of loyal volunteers who are now receiving pension payments that they accept as an honorable expression of the nation's gratitude and appreciation (but who are not in need, or are earning a comfortable living) will willingly see their pension certificates cancelled, rather than allow their honorable service to be used as a cover for pensioning the dishonorable and undeserving.

When the laws are so changed,—by creating a county commissioner of pensions in each county to co-operate with the citizens of his county in seeing that no worthy loyal volunteer, or those immediately dependent upon him, is without the means of a comfortable living, and that no unworthy claimant is allowed to find fraud profitable, —the industry of corruption can be destroyed. When these reforms are carried into effect, I believe that the disbursements on account of pensions, expenses, etc., will be a hundred million dollars less than the estimate for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1892, and that the gain in the spirit of true loyalty, honor, and honesty, will be an enduring benefaction to the nation and to every self-respecting citizen.

Comrades, a new duty is ours. It calls us to enroll for a conflict requiring a finer courage, a truer perception of patriotism, a nobler loyalty, than that of 1861. It requires us to defend our honor from the defamation of character which has come upon us unawares, through the unholy greed of corrupt men who have made use of the gratitude of a generous people and our silence to gain their selfish ends. It requires us to verify the fact while we can,—that it may be known and appreciated now, and taught to posterity,—that the conditions, associations, and influences under which the loyal volunteers of 1861–65 served their country, did not render it necessary for any man to lower his moral standards, or to contract habits of vice; that the men who had the intelligence, courage, and persistent energy to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

win victories on the battle-field, by virtue of these same qualities of character, *are* able successfully to compete for the rewards of civil life with those who did not enter the service; that the majority of men whose terms of service exceeded one year had their life lengthened, and their earning capacity increased, by reason of their army experience. Such a lesson it is our right and duty to teach. In doing this, we shall make a contribution to the cause of good government of the highest and most enduring value.

Comrades of the battle-line, holding the memory of those who fell by our side as a sacred trust, guarding our own honor with a jealous pride, inspired with a sense of loyalty to the nation, and a high ideal of the true dignity of American citizenship, let us separate ourselves from those who are actuated in their clamor for pensions by the lustful greed of selfish gain. Let us inscribe our names upon a roll of honor, and forge for ourselves a badge that shall declare to all who see it, that we were loyal when loyalty required courage, that we were honorable when dishonor was made profitable. Let us leave a record that shall teach the lesson to oncoming generations, that a republic based on the freedom and dignity of labor, and the equality of all men before the law,—when attacked by open-handed courage, or the stealthy corruption of those who use the unthinking and the morally defective as tools to make claims for pensions, that they may fatten on fees,—lived, because it was defended by loyal citizens.

One by one we shall hear the silent call which will bid us welcome to the ranks of those who have gone before us. When that summons comes, we shall move on in light marching order. Of all that we can gain, nothing shall we take, except that which we shall have created for our own identity,—our character. In the highest sense and true meaning of things, no impress of dishonor can be made upon our character except by our own act. If our actions are an honor to us, we shall be honored by all true men. *Character is the body of the soul.*

ALLEN R. FOOTE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION.

At the election of 1890, for the first time since the outbreak of the civil war, the people of Massachusetts elected a majority of Democratic congressmen, and for the third time within that period they chose a Democratic governor. The successful candidate for the latter office was before the people for the third time, having first been nominated in 1888; and the congressional contest was practically a continuation of the presidential struggle of that year. Since the tariff message of President Cleveland in December, 1887, the issues which it raised have overshadowed all others in the politics of Massachusetts. In 1888, when the voters were not yet educated up to a proper understanding of the tariff question, the Republican party carried the State for President by a plurality of 32,000, and elected ten members of Congress out of twelve. In 1889, after another year of active discussion, the plurality of the Republican candidate for governor was cut down to 7,000. In 1890, after the constant agitation of the subject which the pendency of the tariff question in Congress gave rise to, and a campaign chiefly directed against the McKinley Bill, the Democratic candidate for governor was elected by a plurality of 9,000, and the Democratic candidates for Congress received an aggregate vote 5,000 larger than that of their Republican opponents, carrying seven seats out of twelve.

The significance of this action on the part of a commonwealth which for so long a period had been one of the pillars of the Republican party, did not fail to attract wide attention. Republicans throughout the Union felt that their party had received a dangerous blow from an unexpected quarter. Democrats all over the country were filled with the hope of reversing the political conditions that had prevailed in New England. The Republicans of Massachusetts, however, hastened to assure their brethren in other States that the Republican defeat was due to special and temporary causes, and that the next election would show that this State was still staunch in its support of Republican principles. Although the number of votes cast was rather above the average percentage for a congressional year,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they urged, that upon a fuller vote the result would have been different. They pleaded the excuse that the people did not have time to understand the McKinley Bill, and that the Republican speakers were not prepared to expose Democratic misrepresentations as to the effects of that measure. The Democrats of Massachusetts believed that the defeat which they had inflicted upon their opponents had much more significance than the latter were disposed to admit, and that political conditions in this State were undergoing a change which was more than temporary; but they recognized the propriety of awaiting the result of another election before indulging in any very confident predictions as to the possibilities of the future. Remembering that the Republican party had succeeded in defeating for re-election the Democratic governors who had been chosen in 1874 and 1882, they could not claim that a single Democratic victory promised to take the State out of the Republican column.

Ever since the inauguration of a Democratic governor in January last, the Republican party has been actively engaged in a vigorous campaign "to redeem Massachusetts." Its leaders loudly proclaimed that no Democratic governor of Massachusetts ever had been, or ever could be, re-elected. Their organization, already much superior to that of the Democratic party, was made still more thorough and efficient. A strong State club was formed, and local clubs were organized all over the State. Neither ample resources nor untiring efforts seemed to be lacking. Personal and factional differences were suppressed in order that an unbroken front might be presented.

The Republican campaign was opened two weeks earlier than that of the Democrats, in order that ample time might be afforded for reaching every Republican voter. Every question, whether state or national, upon which it was thought that votes might be won, was raised by the Republican leaders, and constantly pressed. Even race and religious prejudice were covertly appealed to in the search for votes. Past leaders of the Republican party, including three ex-governors of the State, came from their retirement, and joined upon the stump the aspirants for its future honors. The collector of the port of Boston, and several of his subordinates, set an example of political activity to other federal officials by enrolling themselves among the campaign speakers of their party. Never before were so many Republican meetings held, even in a presidential year. The oratorical resources of the Republicans entirely surpassed those of the Democrats in quantity, if not in quality; and it soon became evident

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Democratic organization could not hope to equal its rival in the number of campaign speeches. The party fealty of Republican voters was skilfully and persistently appealed to. The Republican managers and leaders appealed to their followers to make a supreme effort to avert the disastrous consequences of another defeat. Towards the last of the campaign, it became clear that the rank and file of the Republican party had been thoroughly aroused. Meetings were large and enthusiastic, the victory was confidently claimed as already won, and many shrewd observers believed that the Democratic cause was almost hopeless.

The supreme effort was made, and the total vote of last year was exceeded by 32,000; yet a Democratic governor was again elected by a plurality of over 6,000, and received nearly 5,000 more votes than were ever before cast for a Democratic candidate in Massachusetts. The Republicans were successful in polling a large increase over the vote which they cast for their candidate for governor last year; but the Democrats offset their efforts by making nearly an equal increase in their vote.

The importance of this result arises from the fact that the Republican leaders made their campaign chiefly upon national issues. Far from concealing the significance of the election, they declared from every stump that the electoral vote of Massachusetts would be in danger in 1892 if a Democratic governor were re-elected in 1891. The chairman of the Republican State Convention in his opening address before that body, and the Republican candidate for governor in his closing speech of the campaign, united in proclaiming the peril, and calling upon their followers to avert it. Nor was the Democratic party at all backward in accepting the national issue raised by its opponents, and in admitting the importance of the election in its bearing upon the approaching presidential contest. National issues were aggressively raised in the Democratic platform. Such leaders of the national party in Congress as Mills of Texas, Wilson of West Virginia, McMillin of Tennessee, and Springer of Illinois, took an active part in the campaign. The tariff issue was still kept at the front, and the McKinley Bill was made the subject of constant attack. Democratic success was won in Massachusetts last year upon this issue, and victory was again achieved this year largely upon the same ground. The effect of the tariff upon prices and upon the raw materials of our great industries was fully and thoroughly discussed.

At the outset of the Republican campaign, the leaders of that party

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made a strenuous effort to put the Democracy of Massachusetts in the attitude of supporting the free coinage of silver, in the hope of alienating the support which the Democratic party had won with the business-men of the State. But the attempt was too transparent to be successful. The people of Massachusetts, without distinction of party, are opposed to the unlimited coinage of silver. There was never any doubt what the utterance of the Democracy of this State would be upon that subject; but the action of the Democratic State Convention of New York removed any possible uncertainty, and made it clear that the Democracy of the East would take common ground upon this matter. The Democratic State Convention at Worcester unanimously adopted a currency plank which placed the party in this State definitely and aggressively in favor of a sound currency. In view of the result of the election, this plank is worth recalling. It was as follows:—

"We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and in a currency convertible into such coinage without loss. This declaration, expressing the uniform historic policy of the national Democratic party, contained in its platforms of 1884 and 1888, we unreservedly re-affirm.

"We believe that all dollars coined by the United States should be of equal intrinsic value, and that all paper currency issued by the government should be redeemable in either gold or silver coin, at the option of the holder, and not at the discretion of the secretary of the treasury.

"We declare with Governor Russell our opposition to any legislation 'which in its results tends to debase our currency, unsettle credit, impair values, and give to labor in depreciated money less than its just due.'

"While we believe in the use of both gold and silver as money, and in the full remonetization of the latter metal by international agreement, we are equally opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver by our government, independent of the action of other nations, and to the dangerous silver legislation enacted at the last session of Congress.

"The Republican party in its national platform of 1888 bid for and received the support of the silver interests by denouncing the Democratic administration as unfriendly to silver. In accordance with the bargain then made, that party has since passed an act increasing the monthly purchases of silver by the Treasury from about 2,000,000 ounces to 4,500,000 ounces. This measure, dictated by the advocates of inflation and by the silver-mine owners who demanded a government bounty on their product, was an abandonment of the cause of honest money, and could not have become a law without the votes of the Republican members of Congress from Massachusetts.

"This act, increasing two and a half times the coinage of eighty cents' worth of silver into a dollar, compelling the Treasury to become the purchaser every day of seven tons of bullion, or more than the whole American product, adding upward of $54,000,000 a year to the volume of currency based upon silver, is a menace to the maintenance of a sound and stable currency, and threatens, if not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repealed, to derange values, impair the obligation of contracts, and bring the currency of the country to a purely silver basis. We therefore denounce the claim of the Republican leaders of this State, that they are the friends of a sound currency, as false and hypocritical, and charge them with the sole and direct responsibility for the present dangerous condition of the currency."

During the rest of the campaign, the Republican party was thus placed upon the defensive on the silver question. Its leaders were obliged to justify, or apologize for, the legislation of last year, which they had voted for in Congress from motives of political expediency, and with full knowledge of its vicious character. While it cannot be claimed that the silver question was of enough importance as an issue of the campaign materially to affect its result, it is still true that the Democratic party was helped by the fact that the position taken by it was recognized by the business community as stronger and sounder than that of its opponent. The aggressive Democratic support of sound money, and the exposure of the dangerous character of Republican legislation, enacted—as one of the congressmen of that party from this State frankly admitted upon the floor of the House of Representatives—"for politics only," certainly contributed something towards giving the Democratic party the strength which made a second victory possible.

The growth of tariff reform sentiment in Massachusetts has been largely due to the persistence with which the justice and necessity of giving to our industries the benefit of free raw materials has been pressed. In the Democratic platform of this year the tariff plank was as follows:—

"The McKinley Tariff Bill, against which the Democratic party of Massachusetts protested at its last convention, was repudiated at the polls by one of the most emphatic votes ever cast by a free people. We renew our demand for the repeal of all its provisions which increase rates of duty, and for the enactment of a genuine measure of tariff reform. We believe that all taxes upon food, fuel, fibres, and ores, and also upon the crude or partly manufactured materials necessary in the processes of our domestic industries, should be repealed, thus affording a genuine protection alike to the workingmen and the manufacturers of our Commonwealth. Five of the Republican congressmen from this State, whom we condemned last year for their surrender of the business interests of New England in order to meet the exigencies of party politics, have been replaced by the people with Democratic members who can be trusted to uphold the rights, and to guard the interests, of their constituents."

This declaration contains the most comprehensive statement of the principles of tariff reform which the Democracy of this State has ever incorporated in a platform. In demanding the repeal of all taxes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon "food, fuel, fibres, and ores, and also upon the crude or partly manufactured materials necessary in the processes of our domestic industries," the party favors a definite and distinct policy, alike beneficial to consumers and to the great mass of producers. The tariff reform victories in Massachusetts have been won, not by arraying consumers against producers, but by favoring a policy which is imperatively demanded in the interest of our industries. Nearly the whole iron industry, and a large section of the wool manufacturing industry, have been brought by the pressure of their business interests to adopt the Democratic position in favor of free raw materials. Before the McKinley Bill was framed, five hundred and ninety-eight corporations, firms, and individuals engaged in the iron industry in New England, petitioned Congress, through the New England representatives, to place iron ore, coal, and coke upon the free list, and to reduce the duty upon pig-iron, scrap-iron, and scrap-steel to twenty-four per cent *ad valorem*, where it stood before the war. The list of signers of this petition included many of the largest firms in the iron business in New England and members of all political parties; and their action placed in the hands of the Democratic party a political weapon which it has effectively used. The woollen manufacturers of the State are only prevented from being equally unanimous in favor of free wool by the loud threats of retaliatory legislation reducing the rates of duty upon woollen goods; but even the fear of such a consequence has not deterred a considerable number of them from giving their open and active support to the Democratic policy. The well-known needs of these two great industries, and the clear necessity, for the continued prosperity of New England, of free coal, free iron ore, and free wool, have enabled the Democratic party to make its campaign of the last few years in favor of tariff reform as the friend of the producer as well as of the consumer. Massachusetts does not ask that any other section of the country should be subjected to burdens for her benefit; but she does demand, through the support which she has twice given to the Democratic party, that other sections shall not be favored by taxation which oppresses her industries. She is willing that other States should enjoy all the natural advantages of possessing within their own limits the raw materials which Nature has denied to her; but she objects to legislation which forces her to pay tribute to them, and deprives her of the natural advantages of her own position upon the seacoast.

The Republican opposition in Massachusetts to the free raw ma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terial policy is insincere and half-hearted, because the leaders of that party are well aware that our industries would be greatly benefited by its adoption. It is purely from reasons of political policy, and a determination to follow the national Republican party blindly in whatever course it may adopt, that the Republican party of this State refuses to agree with the Democratic party upon this issue. But the exigencies of the political situation have apparently forced it in the recent campaign to emphasize this disagreement in a more pronounced manner than ever before. Ex-Speaker Reed of Maine was brought into the Republican campaign this year to denounce the demand of Massachusetts manufacturers and the Democratic party for free raw materials, and to declare that such a policy was entirely inconsistent with the principles of the protective system. Notice was thus served upon all those interested in the iron and woollen industries, that nothing can be expected from the Republican party except uncompromising resistance to the demand for free coal, iron ore, and wool. Mr. Mills of Texas, upon the other hand, in the same campaign gave his complete indorsement to the demand of Massachusetts for free raw materials, and declared the willingness of the national Democratic party to adopt this policy.

Upon the significance of the election as affecting this issue, I venture to quote a few words from my speech in Faneuil Hall on the day before the election. Anticipating the victory which would be won on the next day, I used the following language:—

"Such a Democratic victory has a double meaning. It means the positive belief of Massachusetts on the questions of the day. It means as emphatically her positive repudiation of the methods, the tactics, and the leadership of our political opponents. It means, first, that Massachusetts adheres to her demand of last year for free raw materials for the benefit of her industries and her people. It means that she demands that her sons—first, last, and always—shall stand for her rather than for Ohio or Pennsylvania, and that she stands behind those sons who have stood true to her. It means that she is willing to take her chance in any fair competition, but she demands that in that competition her hands shall not be tied. She objects to a policy that would destroy her natural advantages; she protests against law holding the knife that would cut the throat of any of her industries. True to her history and her traditions, true to the great agitations that she has led for human rights, for freedom and equality, she protests against unequal and unjust taxation."

The recent growth of the Democratic party in Massachusetts dates from the presidential election of 1884. At that time a large body of independent voters, including many of the most distinguished and influential men in the State, left the Republican party. Since that



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, they have been gradually becoming more closely attached to the Democratic party, until to-day nearly all of them are in its ranks. The administration of President Cleveland did a great deal to strengthen his party in this State and to give it the support of the business community. It cannot be claimed that Massachusetts can yet be counted as a Democratic State, whatever she may become in the immediate future; but the last two elections have shown that she is a State where the balance of power is held by a body of independent voters whose political action is guided by principle, and who are firm supporters of tariff reform. The Democratic party of Massachusetts cannot hold out to the national Democracy any strong prospect of securing the electoral vote of Massachusetts next year for any candidates, or for any policies, which cannot command this support; but these voters have now every inclination to continue to give their support to the Democratic cause, and a reasonable course on the part of the national Democracy will probably make Massachusetts a Democratic State in 1892. In order to attain this end, it is of paramount importance that the tariff question should be kept at the front in the next Congress, and that it should be made the one great issue of the presidential campaign. If the Democratic party should commit itself—as fortunately there is now very little chance that it will—to the free coinage of silver, it must be frankly acknowledged that the Democratic ticket would have little chance of success in New England in 1892, whatever might be its prospects elsewhere. We have shown in Massachusetts that we can hold what we have won upon a vote 32,000 larger than that of last year. The Democracy of this State is united and aggressive, and under favorable conditions it believes that it can again hold its own upon the yet larger vote which will be cast in the presidential year. It only asks of the national Democracy a fair opportunity to make this contest.

WILLIAM E. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE JEWISH PERSECUTION—ITS FINANCIAL AND INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS.

THE whole civilized world is saddened by the acts of a Christian government against five or six millions of its subjects. One asks involuntarily, whether the inhuman laws brought to bear against the Jews of Russia are to be pursued to the end; whether there will not be among the nations of Europe a general rising of public opinion against the barbarities which are dishonoring our nineteenth century, so vainly proud of its light and its progress. Is there really a means of stopping the Russian persecution? and will western Europe, seized with indignation, rouse itself, and cry out to the autocratic Czar and his counsellors, "Enough of this! you shall go no farther"?

Some people in America seem to believe in the possibility of action, or at least of a demonstration on the part of the civilized world, against Russia and the Czar, regarding the persecution of the Jews. Such an idea is a chimera, and, I venture to say, a dangerous chimera.

Russia—and by this I mean not only the government, but every thing that counts in the Russian Empire—Russia is justly proud of her power; she is sensitive; she is easily hurt: and every appearance of intimidation on the part of Europe or America, far from improving the situation, will only make it worse.*

The Jews are not the only ones who suffer from the orthodox fanaticism, or, to speak more exactly, from the national fanaticism, of St. Petersburg and Moscow. The Christian dissenters, Protestants or Roman Catholics, are equally exposed to Muscovite hatred and to the ill will of the government, and on the same score, too, as the Jews—less on account of their heterodoxy than as foreigners. So all the representations made to the Russian Government by western associations, all the demonstrations made in England, in Germany, or even in France, in favor of the Catholics or Protestants, have always been without effect. The appeal made to the Czar by the Swiss section of the Evangelical Alliance has not yet been forgotten. The Czar Alexander III. answered it through the procurator-general of the Most

* This is so if we are to trust the opinion of Baron de Hirsch and his representative, Mr. White.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Holy Synod, M. Pobédonostsef, the very incarnation of Russian intolerance. M. Pobédonostsef, in a letter written in French, maintained, in the face of the civilized world, that Russia understands and practises religious liberty. The Imperial Government none the less continued to arrest, to imprison, and to exile the Lutheran pastors of the Baltic provinces who were so bold as to dispute the Russian propaganda.

What the Imperial Government did not tolerate in favor of Lettonian and Esthonian peasants converted fraudulently to official orthodoxy, it will tolerate still less in favor of the Jews. These last, it is true, are more unfortunate than the Protestants. The persecution of the Israelites is carried on with more violence and fervor. But, much as they have to complain of, the Jews are not the most unfortunate of the subjects of the Czar. There are, even in Europe,—in Poland, on the borders of Austrian Gallicia, in what is called Podlachia,—men who suffer yet more, and who suffer for their religion alone. I speak of the Ruthenians or United Greeks, that is to say, of the Christians of the Oriental Rite who recognize the authority of the Pope of Rome. They number about three hundred thousand. The Russian Government has officially suppressed their little church.* It has forced them to return to the Greco-Russian schism; and those of these "Uniotes" who have not been willing to hear mass in the Russian form have been torn from their country, deprived of their patrimony, and even exiled to the Urals. They are there yet, and every attempt at intervention on their behalf has failed, though their small number takes from their conversion all political value.

If the civilized world wishes to bring pressure to bear on the Russian Government, it should not be exclusively in favor of the Jews: it should be also in favor of our Christian brethren, Catholic, Protestant, and United Greek. Now Europe, especially England, has tried several times to bring this pressure to bear, by meetings or by the press, without any good result. Even we in France, in our foremost Parisian journals and reviews, have many times tried to move Russian statesmen in favor of persecuted Christians or Jews; but our efforts have been vain. Sadly enough we are not even sure that, by our representations and pleas to the Imperial Government, we have not injured the Russian dissenters, instead of procuring relief for them.

Formerly the representations or the observations of the European

* See my large work, *L'Empire des Tsars et les Russes* (*La Religion*), vol. ii. book ix. chap. ii.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

press had, it is true, a certain influence, a certain efficacy, in Russia. The Russian Government prided itself on being a civilized government. St. Petersburg and Moscow even feared to scandalize Europe: they were afraid of seeming, in our eyes, to be barbarians, Tartars, Asiatics. The opinion of Europe had thus a certain weight in the Russian balances. To-day it is not the same. Imitation of Europe is no longer in fashion on the banks of the Neva. The examples of the West have no more authority among the Russians, or at least in their official circles. Instead of striving to clothe herself in our manners, the Russia of Emperor Alexander III. tries to show herself in all things Russian and national. After having shown her pride in copying the Occident, she shows her *amour propre* in distinguishing herself from it. This explains the entire domestic policy of the present Czar. His conduct toward the Jews forms a part of his whole system of government: it conforms to a programme whose first article is the purification of Russia from the stains of contact with the Occident.

After this, how can we wonder that our meetings or our newspaper articles have no more influence on the acts of the Imperial Government? They would have such influence only among men who still care for our opinion, for our esteem; and, if there are any such men in Russia,—and many do still remain,—they are all without authority with the government of their country. They grieve in secret with us over the acts of their administration. I have received many confidential expressions in this regard—but they know that they are fated to be powerless: they scarcely even dare, in Russia, to express their opinions.

Manifestations by private individuals in Europe and America cannot, then, stop the Russian Government in the execution of its plans. Would national public manifestations, official representations by the different governments, have a better effect?

There is a point here which is worth the trouble of examining; and, in the first place, on what grounds could the states of Europe or of America make representations to the Russian Government on its conduct regarding its Jewish subjects? It is a principle generally admitted by modern nations, that each nation is mistress in its own domain. This is often called by a quite improper name,—the "principle of non-intervention." There are cases where this principle of non-intervention ought to be held lightly, where the interest of humanity counsels to throw it aside; but in practice, except in the case of one of those petty states whose weakness endangers its independence,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing is more difficult, and in fact nothing is rarer, than the diplomatic intervention of European states in one another's domestic affairs.

The case of the Russian Jews is surely interesting. In the way in which they are treated there is something that shocks our modern conscience. If the interference of foreign countries in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state could be allowed, it would be in such a case. But such interference would be contrary to all diplomatic tradition and usage. If it should take place, we should be sure to see the Russian Government reject it with arrogance. To take an example in America: could one imagine France or England, before the war of secession, making official representations at Washington, to the government of the United States, regarding the existence of slavery? In what manner would the President and the secretary of state of the United States have responded? Nevertheless, if any thing ever wounded Christian humanity and conscience, it was the persistence of slavery under the star-spangled banner.

I know that certain examples of diplomatic intervention in behalf of the Jews in recent times may be cited, especially in the petty states of the Orient. Europe, in the Berlin congress of 1878, demanded of Roumania and Servia the emancipation of the Israelites. Europe also made this emancipation the condition of Roumanian and Servian independence. It was at this price only that she consented to the erection of the two principalities into kingdoms. There, surely, was an important fact; and France, faithful to her traditions of religious liberty, has the right to be proud of having taken, at Berlin, the initiative of this measure. But no one can see here a precedent for the Jews of Russia. The present affair is entirely different.

At Berlin, in 1878, it should be noted, Europe was in congress assembled. She was proceeding to re-arrange the boundaries of the East; she was making, on one side and another, a re-partition of the lands taken from Turkey; she gave or awarded to two petty principalities, up to that time vassals of the Sultan, the rank of independent kingdoms. Europe, then, could lay down conditions to the new kingdoms: the latter were obliged to submit to them, at least in words and on paper. In fact, when the congress was once dissolved, and the new thrones had obtained recognition, Roumania and Servia could act as they pleased. No one is ignorant that in Roumania the promises made at Berlin were far from being fully kept. The situation of the Israelites there remains precarious. Emancipation and the rights of citizens have been granted only to a very small number of Jews.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The masses remain, as in the past, under special laws quite similar to those of Russia; and Europe shuts her eyes. The cabinet of Bucharest continues to regulate in its own way the situation of the Jews of the Lower Danube.

Thus it may be seen that the process used toward Roumania cannot be applied to Russia. Besides, when we have witnessed the manner in which the little Roumanian nation has regarded the injunctions of Europe, we may well ask what the great Russian Empire would do in such a case. Granting that she would answer with fair words the representations of European diplomacy, how could we trust, in such a matter, the promises of the court of St. Petersburg? But Europe would not be sure even of receiving fair words from St. Petersburg. Europe, by meddling in the domestic affairs of the Russian Empire, would expose herself to a rebuff whose humiliation would weigh heavily on all the states imprudent enough to join in so ill-considered a demonstration.

We may cite, even in this century, one case of the intervention of foreign diplomacy in the domestic affairs of the Russian Empire. The example furnishes us with no encouragement. It was in 1863, in favor of a cause not less interesting than that of the Jews,—in favor of the Poles. The intervention of the powers could then be supported by treaties: it was to maintain the convention of Vienna, which, in giving to Russia the greater part of Poland, had guaranteed to the Poles a certain autonomy. The representations of the powers were thus easy to justify, since they demanded simply the execution of a treaty. On this ground, in fact, France and England, drawing Austria with them, placed themselves in all their notes to the Russian Government. The intention was good; the representations of the three governments were founded on a common fact of law; but they had a no less sad result: by wounding the self-love of the Russians, by exciting the national sentiment, they worked against the unhappy Poles. The *protégés* of Anglo-French diplomacy became its victims.

And it could scarcely be otherwise. The intervention of the foreigner in behalf of the subjects of the Czar could only irritate their master against them. It would be the same with regard to the Jews to-day. A diplomatic intervention, under whatever form, can have no force unless it is supported by arms. To succeed, it is necessary to have behind diplomacy the *ultima ratio*. Otherwise it is only a sterile and dangerous demonstration. The excuse of the French Government in 1863 was, that, in addressing remonstrances to Russia, it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seemed inclined to support the notes of its ministers with its fleet and armies. But neither England nor Austria showed herself disposed to go to extremes. They contented themselves with words; and words not followed by actions have no power to accomplish any thing.

Can it be thought that what Europe did not venture to do in 1863 on behalf of the Poles, she will try to do in 1891 on behalf of the Jews? To understand what the unhappy Israelites can gain by diplomacy, it is necessary to glance at the present situation of Europe. Is it favorable to an intervention—even to a simple moral intervention—on the part of the European powers in behalf of the Russian Jews? It seems to me that it is not.

It is well known what dissensions there are in Europe. Because of these dissensions, Russia is never obliged to regard European opinion in the least. The war of 1870–71 between France and Germany—or, more precisely, the Treaty of Frankfort, which tore from France Alsace-Lorraine—had the fatal consequence of cutting in two western Europe, the old Europe of Germano-Latin civilization. Studying it well, here is seen the principal, and perhaps the saddest, result of that ill-fated war. For a long time Russia will run no risk of finding a united Europe opposed to her.

It is, above all, from this point of view with regard to Russia, that it is proper to say, "There is no more Europe." In this sense, Bismarck and Von Moltke labored for the Russian Czar. They have made a new Sebastopol impossible. By changing the French frontier, they have forced France to look to the north with other eyes; to see in the Muscovite colossus no more a common danger for Europe, but an eventual ally for France, menaced by the cannon of Metz and Strasburg.

This is not the place to explain the cause and the character of what is called "*l'entente Franco-Russe.*" That would force us to make too long a digression. Suffice it to say, that, in the situation made for France and for Europe twenty years since, that relation was inevitable. One has even the right to be surprised that it has taken so long to show itself and to strengthen itself. The renewal of the Triple Alliance during last summer ended by bringing about the ostensible *rapprochement* of the two powers threatened by the Triple Alliance. That France and Russia should remain separate, it would have been necessary that the three other continental powers should renounce a league, that, under pretext of maintaining peace, condemns Europe for all time to the ruinous *régime* of extreme armaments.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is sometimes thought, that, in joining hands at Cronstadt, Russian Czarism and French Democracy have shown bellicose intentions. Nothing could be more false as far as France is concerned. Every one in France, except a weak minority, wants peace. Wrong or right, the French believe that peace is better assured if France is not isolated, face to face with the Triple Alliance. The character of the young emperor of Germany, and the morbid nervousness of that versatile sovereign, inspire in Paris little confidence. We always fear on his part some foolhardy action, and, though France feels that she is ready for any event, it seems to her wiser to assure herself, in case of need, that there will be a diversion in Germany's rear.

As to Russia, I believe her equally pacific, at least to-day. The autocratic emperor, whose will is law from the Vistula to Kamshatka, has few military tastes. He has made war in Bulgaria, and in witnessing the horrors of war he seems to have taken a dislike to it. If he is compared to his young neighbor, Kaiser William, the Czar Alexander III. is surely, of the two sovereigns,—the only two men whose caprice can throw Europe into a great war,—the one who by his temperament, by his tastes, by his habits, gives most sureties for peace. This is the opinion of all those who know a little about Russian matters. This is not the only point on which there is often misapprehension at Berlin, at Vienna, at Rome, even at London—perhaps also in New York. Surprise is often affected at the Franco-Russian understanding, which people are often pleased to name "an alliance against nature." And, to be sure, if the two states are compared, they are at the two opposite poles of Europe. All their institutions, all their tendencies, separate them. Only, it is forgotten that these are not always the governmental affinities that decide the policy and the alliances of states. When King Louis XVI. allied himself against England, with the American rebels, it was surely not to foment the spirit of revolt at home. Likewise, to-day, if France draws near to Russia, it is not at all through sympathy for autocratic rule; it is simply in defiance of Prussian militarism and of the covetousness of the Triple Alliance.

Though they play in their public places the *Boje Tsaria Khrani* [the Russian national anthem], the French guard none the less their love of political and religious liberty. They do not believe that they are obliged to imitate the actions of the Russian Government. Because the latter persecutes the Jews, the Jews are not less tranquil in Paris. In no country in the world do the Israelites rank so high in propor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion to their number. The fugitives that come to us from Russia find our frontiers open. Still more, all the French press that counts for any thing has nobly condemned the excesses of Muscovite anti-Semitism. The Jews of Russia know this, and they have several times thanked the Parisian press for the aid that it has tried to give them. It might be hoped that the voice of friendly France might find more echo in St. Petersburg or Moscow than the suspected voices of Germany or of England: unfortunately, notwithstanding the well-wishing and discreet tone of our remonstrances, the Imperial Government has hitherto remained deaf to them.

But if France, like all Europe, reprobates the acts of Russian *tchinovnism* toward the Jews, does it follow that French diplomacy, if the demand should be made of it, would consent to give countenance to demands made on the Czar by other powers? Surely not; and we have already given the reasons. France knows that such intervention could succeed only if behind the notes of ambassadors should be seen the mouths of cannon. Now France is peaceable. She desires to maintain peace, and, besides, she does not wish uselessly to offend the Russian Government. For this reason alone, if others should take the initiative, the French Republic would hold itself back officially from such steps.

It is not to be thought, in short, that any European state would venture to present observations on this subject to the Czar's government. All feel the uselessness of diplomatic representations, and no one would wish to expose itself to a war in defence of the Russian Jews. The remedy, in fine, would be worse than the disease. Without going to a possible extreme, if certain powers—if the Triple Alliance, for instance—should think best to assume on this occasion a threatening attitude toward Russia, the Jews would run the risk of being the first victims. Neither in Germany, nor in Austria, nor in Italy, would people pardon them for complicating European difficulties, and for thus increasing the chances of a conflict. It would be bad for the Jews if one should see in them a danger to peace. That would be the saddest thing that could happen to them, from one end of Europe to the other. Anti-Semitism would gain new force everywhere, and would point them out more than ever as public enemies. Thus, far from desiring for the persecuted race the aid of diplomacy, I dread nothing so much for Israel as the open intervention of governments in her favor.

But that is neither to be feared nor hoped for. For all the reasons

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that we have analyzed, Europe will not move. The Russia of M. Pobédonostsef is not less free than the Spain of Torquemada to do to her Jews as she wills. No one will interfere. If Moscow wishes to renew the *autos-da-fé* of the *quemaderos* of Castile, no power will make war to extinguish the fagots. This is the sad truth. If the persecutors of the Jews do not have recourse to the executioners and the tortures of the middle ages, that is simply because, in spite of her systematic isolation, the spirit of humanity of our century has made itself felt even in the steppes of Russia.

The Jews, then, have no aid to look for from the governments or the diplomats of Europe. They must be content with the Platonic encouragement that can be given them by individuals, the press, and private associations. It is thus alone that we may hope to influence the directing powers of Russia, and, if not arrest, at least soften, the rigors of the persecution. It is not by threats that Europe and the civilized world have some chance of working on Russian opinion, and on the counsels of the Czar; it is by showing that their actions toward the descendants of Jacob are unworthy of a great nation; it is by proving to them, above all, that this anti-Semitic campaign, far from serving the Russian people, is contrary to the best interests of state and nation. This proof the facts themselves must give; and perhaps the lessons of the facts will be listened to by the masters of Russia more willingly than the importunate voice of the philanthropists and liberals of the Occident.

Here, however, we must keep ourselves from illusions. Certain persons once imagined that the Jews had a means of bringing the Russian Government to terms, that is, through the national finances. It was said, that, Israel being in a large degree master of the financial markets of Europe, it would be easy for her to force the enemies of the Jews, by means of the Paris bourse and the London stock exchange, to render account to the Twelve Tribes. And this idea seemed to be not without foundation, seeing that the treasury of the autocratic empire cannot do without the aid of foreign money-markets. It seemed that St. Petersburg had too much need of placing loans, deliberately to alienate the cosmopolitan Jewish bank by making war on its own Jewish subjects. This was even the opinion of some Russians, and even of certain inspirers of the ultra-national policy of the Czar Alexander III. It was notably the opinion of Katkof, the celebrated director of the "Moscow Gazette." Katkof was one of the most ardent promoters of the Muscovite national fanaticism; but he declared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against anti-Semitism. He feared that, in making a too zealous war on the Jewish "factors" and pedlers of Poland, Russia might expose herself to the vengeance of great European financiers. Unfortunately for the Jews, Katkof is dead, and, instead of having confirmed his apprehensions, the event seems so far to have gone contrary to them.

Here is a curious phenomenon, unforeseen by all, whose explanation it is worth while to seek. Contrary to the predictions of all experts, Russian finances seem to have suffered nothing from the attacks made by the Russians on the race that includes the majority of financiers. On the contrary, since the opening of the campaign against the Jews, Russian funds have not ceased to rise. The Imperial Government has been able several times to borrow considerable sums on the most advantageous terms, and to bring to a favorable conclusion the most lucrative conversions. To make the ruble fall notably in value, nothing less has been necessary than a veritable famine in a great section of the empire.

How explain this phenomenon? Is the much-vaunted solidarity of Israel in face of the enemies of her people to fail this time? I know people who are astonished to see Jewish bankers lend their aid to the Russian loans of recent years. Perhaps the Israelitic houses that have been associated in these operations have been influenced by this double consideration: 1. The bankers may have thought, as business-men, that the Russian loans would succeed in spite of their abstention, and that, accordingly, not being able to prevent their success, it was better not to leave the profits to others; 2. They may have thought, as Jews, that to shut their doors to Russian loans would be to risk irritating the Czar and his ministers, and to aggravate, instead of ameliorate, the situation of the Israelites in the empire.

The most recent of the Russian loans, the one subscribed in Paris last October, was not brought before the public by the Rothschilds. None the less did it succeed. The cause of its success is easy to point out. There is among us in France some one richer than the Rothschilds. It is "Mr. Everybody." Now, in France, at this moment, "Mr. Everybody"—that great capitalist, more powerful than all the bankers—is well disposed toward Russia. He offers her his money willingly. In intrusting his savings to the Czar, the *bourgeois* or the peasant thinks that he is doing a patriotic deed. The attacks aimed from Berlin or London against Russian finances only stimulated the host of French subscriptions. Here is an immense advantage for Russia. In this alone she has received from France a greater service

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than, perhaps, she knows how to return. And—is it difficult to remember?—this financial aid from France, the richest nation of the Old World, is yet again one of the consequences of the European situation. Here again, though he is innocent of it, the Jew is its victim. Historic events sometimes rebound thus in the wrong direction: in this sense one may say that the Jews are paying for the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany. Without this fatal cutting in two of Europe, which opens the purse of France to Russia, the Jews would probably have kept enough control over the markets of Europe to cause all the Russian loans to fail. They would have had an almost certain means of forcing Russia to ask an end of hostilities. To-day, thanks to the divisions of Europe, they see the people of France putting a check on their financial power. They are passed by: great loans are subscribed without them. They see themselves thus temporarily deprived of their most powerful weapon. This event, new in Europe, has at least this much of good for the Jews: it has shown at their expense, that, in spite of all the clamor of the anti-Semites, the Jews are far from having absorbed all the wealth of Europe, and monopolized the financial affairs of the globe.

Thus Europe and the civilized world, in this lamentable affair, have no means of moving Russian Czarism. Europe can act on Russia to the profit of the persecuted neither by diplomacy, nor by arms, nor by money. In reality, we have only one means of working on the autocratic Czar and his counsellors,—our example. To the measures of persecution at St. Petersburg, we must oppose European and American liberty. To the short-sighted Russians who pretend that the Jew is but a death-bearing parasite, we must show what liberty and equality have already made, in two or three generations, of the Jews of the West. This response to the accusations of their Muscovite detractors, the Israelites particularly must give by their labor, by their honesty, by their good will toward the Christian nations who have received them well. For the civilized peoples of Europe and America there is still one way of acting on this foreign and re-actionary Russia. It is to give an asylum to the fugitives who come to ask us for a land where they can live and die free. To shut our ports and our frontiers against them is to take part against them; it is to approve, in the eyes of the world and before God, those who have driven them out; it is to say to the Czar's police, "You are right in banishing them from your country, the proof is that we do not want them in ours."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That the Russia of Emperor Alexander III. is imitating at the end of the nineteenth century the barbarous acts of the Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella, should not, in fine, astonish us greatly. Russia, by those who know her, cannot be judged after the same standard as the other Christian states of Europe or America. The Russia of Alexander III. is not, properly speaking, a nation contemporaneous with the England of Queen Victoria. Russia is in reality a state of another age, not only a state of the old *régime*, but in many respects, by her institutions and her customs, a state of the fifteenth century Is it surprising that she should often reproduce errors that we consider most shocking and disastrous? In doing as she does with her Jews, Russia is acting, after all, in the Russian fashion,—an old obsolete fashion, which happily is no longer that of the Occident. What would be truly a scandal and a shame for our civilization would be to see the civilized countries of Europe and America repel from their territory the unfortunate victims of Russian persecution. Our feeling of humanity must be quite narrow, and have little depth, if the Russian exiles do not find among us in 1891 or 1892 the refuge that Holland, Italy, France, and the Grand Turk accorded three or four centuries ago to the exiles of Spain and Portugal.

ANATOLE LEROY-BEAULIEU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## FRENCH FEELING TOWARDS GERMANY.

It is only too certain that the existing antagonism between Germany and France constitutes to-day the chief threat of a bloody war in Europe, and that it is strong enough to have transformed the Old World, after twenty years of peace, into a vast camp bristling with guns and cannon, always on the *qui-vive*, always ready to take up arms at the first alarm.

One may say that nearly all the alliances formed or attempted in this period have been conceived with a view to the strife always anticipated between these two powerful nations. The conflicting interests of Austria and Russia in the Balkan Peninsula, and the prospect of gathering up the last spoils of the Turkish Empire, or of dominating the petty states born of its former dismemberments, certainly constitute a second cause of possible conflict, which would exist without the first. But the rivalries and distrust excited by this other question should be subordinated to the situation of Germany with regard to France, on account of the preponderating influence wielded during the last twenty years by the German nation. In this way all the great continental powers, from the Caspian Sea to the Atlantic Ocean, have formed two groups, which recent occurrences have brought to light, but which the force of events and the community of interests had long ago practically established, or at least prepared.

This is not all. Even states of small dimensions to which treaties, always hitherto respected, have assured the benefits of neutrality, are bound to share the general alarm. Belgium, marked out as the possible field of battle for her two neighbors,—a country whose king has been suspected of joining with Germany in order to pave the way for a new invasion,—is obliged to fortify her frontiers, and to increase her armies. Switzerland is exposed to the same perils by the same neighbors. Is it necessary to add, that neither the Low Countries nor the Scandinavian states can claim that they have no interest in the matter?

The New World, which has the good fortune to be able to devote all her resources to the fertile labors of peace, must be stupefied by the way in which the constant anticipation of an imminent conflict

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has destroyed, and is yet destroying, the wealth of years in old Europe. France, from the end of the last war to 1889, spent twelve or thirteen milliards of francs for the support of her military and naval forces, and more than two milliards and a half for the renewal of her military *matériel:* say, about fifteen milliards in all. The exact figures for Germany have not been given to the public since that date; but the disbursements ought to be very nearly the same, except for the navy. One of the two countries spends annually about nine hundred; the other, about eight hundred millions; the group of five great continental powers spend the alarming amount of three milliards. Still, these heavy expenditures, far from decreasing, seem to increase, year by year. One is forced to ask, How long can European labor, obliged to compete with that of the New World, support such overwhelming burdens?

Nevertheless, these expenses seem small when compared with the unprecedented ravages which would be committed by the nations transformed into armies, having at their command (bought with these fabulous sums) the machinery of modern scientific destruction,—engines hitherto kept concealed, and every one of them untested, to the invention of which the genius of specialists has been devoted for twenty years. I recently saw the English fleet and the French fleet together in the waters of Spithead; and before these monsters of iron and steel, —which have no longer the appearance of ships, but resemble rather fantastic cities, formidably fortified, rising from the midst of vessels, and which within have as many mechanical devices for devastation and massacre as the most perfect manufactory has for its beneficent labor, —I asked myself what unknown powers of annihilation the world would see at work, if these terrible engines should begin their sinister task.

What is the nature of the antagonism between France and Germany? I have no authority to reply in behalf of Germany. I would seek the explanation for France by recurring a little to the history of this century, in order to find the origin of the present condition.

When the war of 1870, so disastrous to our country, broke out, there existed in Germany a great feeling of hatred for France; but the French were far from cherishing the same feeling for their Germanic neighbors. We must remember that the hatred cherished by the people across the Rhine has been explained historically. Heinrich Heine, who ridiculed his compatriots so delicately, wittily warned the French to distrust the Germans, who had cherished resentment against them for the death of some emperor or other of the middle ages. Un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fortunately, the springs of the feelings that Bismarck had only to re-awaken were less archæological. Every one knows how the first Napoleon treated Germany in general, and Prussia in particular, which, after his victory at Jena, he reduced to a cipher. No country, perhaps, suffered more cruelly from the ambition and the despotism of a powerful conqueror. And the Germans, in love with that liberty which our Revolution had hailed with enthusiasm, and which our republican armies had achieved, came to detest imperial France. The most illustrious among the thinkers and poets of Germany took part in the patriotic movement which prepared the ruin of Napoleon; and the story of the violence committed by the despot by means of French armies remains fixed in literary masterpieces, to be presented to the memories of posterity.

Although nearly fifty years had rolled away when Bismarck endeavored to arouse these recollections, it was easy to re-animate them. France, about 1867, was absolutely ignorant of the manner in which every means had been employed, even the education of children in the schools, to rekindle the fire which had been smouldering under the ashes for half a century. She did not take advantage of similar means to protect herself against Germany. It is true that, at the epoch of the Revolution, Prussia had been the first to attack her, and that, at the fall of Napoleon, the Prussians had been the most violent and the most destructive of her invaders. Their chief Blucher, one of the conquerors of Waterloo, had shown an incredible military brutality. But these memories had been effaced. In the period which had followed the first empire,—either while France chafed under the king which foreigners had imposed on her, or after the revolution of 1830, when she was under a pacific monarch,—she indulged again in her dreams of aggrandizement. The Napoleonic legend, confounded, by a strange and sad aberration, with ideas of liberty, dominated all minds. It was, however, against England—which had sustained the weight of the contest against the first empire, and had given to Napoleon his prison and his jailer—that the popular resentment caused by our defeats of 1817 was principally concentrated. It has wholly disappeared to-day, and all clear minds understand the necessity for close friendship between France and Great Britain. But a long time has been necessary for the effacement of this sentiment. Austria shared with England the animosity of the masses. Not only had the traditional policy of France, for centuries back, striven to weaken her, but during the first half of this century Austria represented, in the eyes of



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolutionary France, the spirit of the old absolute monarchies, and mounted guard in Europe for the cause of reaction. It may be said that she was the enemy *par excellence* of all liberal parties.

On the contrary, the grand movement of the literary renaissance, which occurred with us about 1830, had established between France and Germany true intellectual bonds. Poets, philosophers, historians, savants, had drunk from Germanic springs, or at least felt a deep sympathy for German poetry, philosophy, and science. Besides, against Austria, Prussia, which was even at this period much less strong, seemed the natural ally of France. She was regarded as relatively the liberal monarchy of the Germanic world. The idea of nationality, which she promulgated for her own profit, was very popular. Then—as soon as Bismarck begun his efforts to bring about the acknowledged unity of Germany, relying by a skilful change of base on the men whom Prussia in 1848 had pursued as revolutionists—a notable party of liberal views, in France, devoted itself with somewhat thoughtless zeal to the work of forcing public opinion. They tried to make German unity as popular with us as Italian unity had been; and the government of Napoleon III. was not unfavorable to this attempt.

I have dwelt on these facts from the past to show that the animosity of the French against Germany has among us no ancient root. Of course, one could have found among some persons, or in some regions, those feelings of antipathy, which, by a survival of the old sentiments of primitive humanity, exist too often in modern nations against foreigners, whoever they may be. According to the chances of character, of life, or of education, one prefers the Italians, another the English, or some other people. Above all, it is the rule that among the populations most intimately connected by the proximity of their dwellings, and often by their race and their customs, contact and incessant friction breed rivalry mingled with feelings of hostility. These were the feelings entertained by Belgians toward the Hollanders, and by the French Flemings of the north toward the Belgian Flemings. It is, then, quite possible that there was not too much love for the Germans on our eastern frontiers. But this was an entirely local state of feeling; and before Sadowa one would have found in the greater part of France that a contrary tendency prevailed.

Such was the state of feeling when we were awakened by the thunder-clap of Sadowa. Suddenly Austria, weakened for a long time, was succeeded as the preponderating power in the Germanic world by Prussia, a country yet young, and to be feared on account

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of her rapid rise. In the centre of Europe two great military monarchies—the French empire and the Prussian kingdom—stood face to face. It was only too easy to foresee a bloody conflict between them. For a long time, antagonism had existed between the two powers; but, at least on our side, it was no longer an antagonism between the two peoples.

At this period, in fact, the Imperial Government was marching to its ruin, and public opinion did not espouse its quarrels any longer. In general, militarism was never so unpopular in France as in the last period of the empire. The increasing hatred felt toward the *coup d'état* of 1851, where the army had drowned our liberties in blood; the Mexican war, which had been so foolishly undertaken, and so badly ended; the revolutionary sentiment that was growing in the cities; the discontent with the heavy expenses of war and with the needless bloodshed, which was spreading in the rural districts,—diverted the popular mind altogether from those outbursts of warlike zeal which had been so frequent in France. There had taken place in the ranks of the army, against both the spirit of militarism and the Imperial Government, a reaction, which was notably displayed in the comparatively large number of negative votes cast among the troops, under the eyes and in spite of the pressure of military chiefs, in the *plébiscite* of 1870. I do not believe, that, in the years that preceded the declaration of war,—in spite of the continual expectation of a terrible conflict between Prussia and France, and the incidents that caused it to break out soon afterward,—the great number of Germans who lived in France could have been the object of a hostile manifestation. The war itself did not carry the people with it. Those who are always saying that the "populace" of Paris demanded it, say that which is contrary to the truth. This war—which was clearly undertaken to regain for the Imperial Government prestige and power, and which was a threat with the sword against the liberal and republican movement—was necessarily distasteful to the Parisians, among whom, besides, at this epoch, the spirit of international socialism prevailed with great strength. In the bands of men in white blouses who could be seen passing along the boulevards, showing great warlike enthusiasm by crying, "To Berlin!" and by maltreating the advocates of peace, it was easy to recognize those masquerading police-agents of whom the empire made use in its last years to simulate popular demonstrations; and the real people would have made it hot for them, if they had not been under the protection of *sergents de ville*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As for the rural districts, these, contrary to the cities, gave to the imperial *plébiscite* a formidable majority, which seemed to show that they saw in it, as was said of them, a pledge of peace. I have actually seen the reports of prefects (and they have been published elsewhere) which were found among the emperor's papers after the Revolution. All of them asserted that the rural districts had a great repugnance to war. The way in which it was brought about renders these impressions more vivid. To-day it seems no longer doubtful that Bismarck, knowing his power and our weakness, desired the conflict; but he knew how skilfully to lure on the French Government until it made itself responsible for pursuing an aggressive policy. This was not difficult: dynastic interest was here only too visible. Napoleon III. was growing old, and might die, leaving a woman and a child confronted with a formidable opposition: victories were necessary to strengthen their position. It was in this sense that the empress said of the war which was about to be waged, and which was necessary to her, "It is my war." And this saying was known also to the public. It is, then, easy to understand that the combat began without any ardor on the part of France, and without animosity against the Germans with whom we were embroiled.

Things altered rapidly. After the first defeats, our territory was invaded, and we defended our soil and our fatherland. After the revolution of the 4th of September, when Bismarck refused to accept the ransom that the new government offered him, and demanded Alsace-Lorraine, one may say that France struggled for life. During this period of the war, every thing seemed to combine to establish between the two peoples a durable barrier of resentment and hate. It is well known how pitiless the victors were. The shooting of the captive *francs-tireurs*, who were executed under the pretence that the independent corps did not belong to the army; the deeds of violence and the ravages which invasions bring with them; the bombardment of Paris, useless from a military point of view, since it inspired in the besieged city rage instead of fear,—all exasperated to madness the hatred against the Germans. It is known what animosity the Prussian people manifested, even accusing their own leaders of showing too much consideration. As for the bombardment of Paris, in particular, it is well known, and the last work of Von Moltke confirms the statement, that public opinion demanded it, and found it too deliberate. It is useless to recall the fact that the conditions of peace seemed to show an intention of giving France the *coup de grâce*. The formi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dable figures of the indemnity demanded (five milliards of francs) exceeded by more than half the actual expenses of Germany in the war, and were plainly calculated to ruin us once for all. The whole world was astonished that France could support such a burden; and her rapid financial recovery was a surprise for every one. I know that after the civil war the United States found themselves under the weight of sums still more colossal. But a country so old as ours has not the same resources of rapidly increasing wealth, and it has to bear, besides, the burden of preceding epochs. The frightful cost of the war was summed up for us in a debt already as large as fifteen milliards.

It was the piece of French soil cut off by the Prussian sabre, that could not fail to make the antagonism irreparable. It has been asserted for a long time that Alsace was German. She has, it would seem, sufficiently proved the contrary. Neither race nor language forms nationalities. The United States, though composed of so many diverse races, constitutes, nevertheless, a nation with which it would not be safe to interfere. And when she won her right to existence, she strove against a people of the same blood. Switzerland—small in territory, great in intelligence and labor—consists of three pieces, of which one is German in tongue and race, another French, and another Italian. It would be none the less a crime to dismember it, and distribute the three fragments among three nations to which they do not wish to be united. A nationality is formed by historic circumstances which make the populations conscious of forming the same body, and desirous of living together. It is founded on law and liberty, and not on physiological circumstances. But what of Lorraine,—French in blood, French in language,—which the victor demanded? It was inevitable that France should retain, after peace, the feeling that she had been mutilated, and that her enemy had wished to kill her.

Must we conclude that all these memories should establish an ineffaceable antipathy between the two nations? Assuredly not. It is a fatal characteristic of all wars that they cause violence and odious cruelty; but it would be too unfortunate if the traces should never be effaced, and if the inevitable excesses of the time of strife should indefinitely survive, in the resentments that they cause, the circumstances that have produced them. All nations would then be condemned to eternal hate. But here there was something more durable than the memories of violence,—possession by Germany of two provinces incontestably French at heart.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The whole truth must be spoken: otherwise it will make itself heard. On the morrow after the war, one could not have found, perhaps, in all France, two opinions with regard to the conqueror. The protest against the conquest was confused in all minds with the very idea of native country. All parties, from the most zealous reactionists to the most ardent revolutionists; all classes, from the poorest of manual laborers to the richest land-owners; all the provinces of the land, urban or rural, from the North Sea to the Mediterranean and from the Vosges to the Ocean,—were united in a single thought in face of Germany. Twenty years have passed: the state of feeling is the same.

It has not changed, and it is not possible to believe that it will change so long as its cause has not disappeared. It is neither the humiliation of the defeat, nor resentment for the pitiless deeds of the victor, that keeps up this unanimity. France forgets quickly. She yields so little obedience to a profound hatred, that many Germans, just as before the war, have been able to come and establish themselves at Paris; and they live there undisturbed. To be sure, they prefer, in their relations with the public, to assume another nationality; and the number of Prussians who call themselves Swiss or Austrians is very large. But aside from two or three tumults in beer-saloons, started by a handful of roisterers, the Germans have lived very quietly in France during the last twenty years.

The example of Italy, besides, shows how quickly antagonisms disappear which have no longer a real incentive. For centuries, the Italian peoples have had the most powerful reasons for animosity against the Austrians. Of old, Austria crushed Italy beneath her yoke; it may be said that she martyred the Italian patriots; she drowned in blood all attempts at relief: and nevertheless, as soon as Venice was free, the ancient hate began to vanish. It is so well effaced, that the government of Rome is to-day allied to Austria.

But so long as there is between France and Germany an Alsace-Lorraine, forcibly held by our neighbors, it does not seem possible to foresee a reconciliation. Diversions have been attempted. Whatever may have been the intentions of the French ministries of 1881–85, it is quite plain that colonial conquests like those of Tunis, of Tonkin, of Madagascar, resulted in taking from the eastern frontier the attention and the forces of France. Although these operations occupied only a very small part of our military resources, the complications that they might bring with them obliged us, in a certain degree, to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obtain some security on the side of the German Empire, and in consequence to be more friendly with it. Bismarck understood this perfectly; and it is certain, that, if he did not suggest these enterprises, he at least encouraged them. His policy for remaining master in Europe, always consisted in engaging others in enterprises of this character, which he was wise enough to disdain on the part of Germany. It was at the congress of Berlin, which he absolutely directed, that the assignment of Tunis to France was resolved upon. But far-away conquests became quickly the object of a violent unpopularity with us. And even their authors have never been able to avow their evident tendency in all that concerns European politics.

France remains, then, exactly in the situation of the day after the war; and it cannot be otherwise. It is scarcely needful to dwell on the feelings which are naturally suggested to her by the spectacle of two provinces insisting, under foreign domination, on proclaiming their attachment to their former country. Without doubt, one can never find in history a case where a nation has rejected and abandoned populations that continue so faithful to her. Every one has noted that German sentiment has made no progress in Alsace-Lorraine. After twenty years, the condition of affairs there is the same as it was the day after the conquest. The German Government itself admits this by the rigors which it persists in inflicting on these two provinces, by the military rule under which it holds them, by the precautions that it has taken, even going so far as to seal the frontiers so hermetically that international communication was interrupted, and that no one—not even the English, the Russians, or the Americans—could, at least without special permit, cross Alsace-Lorraine in an express going from Paris to Vienna or Munich. You know that this interdict was raised only a few days ago.

It may be understood how difficult it would be for France to resign herself finally to the loss of provinces which remain so French that their master is still reduced to the employment of such means against them. But it must be added that she would give them up to no profit. Suppose that not only were the memories of the war blotted out, but that France—anxious above all for peace, tired of an ineffectual protest, exhausted by the military expenses which the present situation demands—should forget those that have been separated from her, and abandon even the hope of seeing them re-united again: would Germany believe in this resignation? Even if she should accept it as sincere, could she consider it lasting? Would she not fear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a generation more ardent would return, five or ten years later, to the hopes and the passions of former days? Would not a movement of opinion, or a new event, suffice to re-awaken them? Germany plainly would not find any security in such a desertion of her own cause by France. She would continue to take the same precautions, and to seek the same alliances against us.

We are, then, forced to admit that the situation created by the conquest of Alsace-Lorraine condemns the two countries to look on each other as enemies, and remains a menace to European peace. Such is the universal opinion in France to-day, as in 1871. It is incontestable that things have remained in the same condition, and that all Frenchmen have remained in accord on this point.

Besides, it is vain to seek to discover what practical form measures of reconcilement may take, so long as the same feelings exist on both sides of the Vosges. The dream has often been entertained of relieving Europe, ruined by her military armaments, by a simultaneous disarmament, to which the different powers should bind themselves by treaty; each one promising to retain only such part of its military force as should be fixed by common accord. A little reflection suffices one to understand how chimerical such a treaty would be. Where would be the guaranty of its execution? And how could each of the contracting parties be prevented from keeping up more considerable forces than those avowed in its official documents? For example, it would be vain to oblige France and Germany to keep in time of peace only three hundred thousand men under arms. Each of the two would be quite at liberty to have twice as many, and hide the surplus. It is quite plain that this dissimulation would pass for a deed of patriotism, and that every one would be privy to it, both in the halls of legislation and in the country at large. Incessant recriminations would be exchanged; they would give place to numberless contests: and war would be very apt to arise from the precautions taken for the sake of peace. Following his most brilliant victories, the first Napoleon regulated by treaty the number of the military forces which the remnant he had left of Prussia should have the right to maintain. He was the absolute master; he could superintend at pleasure in Germany, which was reduced to the last degree of powerlessness, the execution of the treaty that he had imposed. He was not one of those who are easily deceived. But none the less, at this period, thanks to the patriotic union of all her citizens, Prussia, though weakened, prepared redoubtable forces, which soon afterwards contributed greatly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the ruin of the conqueror. What would be the value of a treaty between nations which hold in no degree the position held then by Prussia, put by her defeats at the mercy of the despot,—nations that are absolutely independent, and no one of which would have any efficacious means of surveillance over another? This would be pure fatuity.

It is well known how powerful with us is the feeling that I have tried to define. Nothing costs too much for France that puts her in a position to meet the coming conflict. The most despotic government, after a *coup d'état* that had decimated its opponents, would not succeed in imposing such obligatory military service as exists to-day. This military law is a terrible burden; it lays its hand on every family; it tears every year from the fields thousands of toilers who are too often lost for all time to labor, a great number, on leaving their regiments, being unfitted for rural life, and going to swell the surplus population of the cities; it interrupts, finally, the education necessary for professional careers, imperilling greatly the recruitment of that *élite* of intellect that is indispensable to the vital functions of a modern nation.

We must add the annual manœuvres, which for forty years have taken all the citizens from their occupations,—the laborer from his field, the merchant from his counting-room, the workman from his shop. Nevertheless, these rigorous obligations are scarcely discussed, and the rare and isolated attempts made in certain circles to find a demand for a decided relaxation of the present military service, as means of political action, have been almost unanimously disavowed and smothered. Every mother has given her children without a murmur; every Frenchman has accepted without complaint the heavy sacrifice of time and liberty which the service imposes. In this country, more burdened with taxes than any other in the world, there is no haggling over millions for the army, and the military expenses are not even discussed with the attention which is demanded by care that only what must be spent shall be spent; so much force does the government find in public sentiment, when it demands the most enormous sums for our armament! It is not even unheard of for the chambers to force the ministers to take more than they demand.

By an antithesis which at a distance it seems difficult to allow, it is an insurmountable fact, and absolutely undeniable, that this people, so unanimous in regard to its military preparations, does not want war, and will not take the initiative in it. It is only necessary to see France to assure one's self that an act of aggression on her part is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

altogether improbable. It would seem quite natural that a state of antagonism which is imposed on two nations in the presence of ruinous sacrifices, would make them both impatient to put an end to it. Nevertheless, it does nothing of the kind. One may traverse all parts of France without finding anywhere a warlike spirit. The lessons of 1871 were too severe to allow any one, in spite of general confidence in our military re-organization, to regard lightly the eventuality of a conflict. All feel too deeply what terrible ravages in the industrial world such as present necessities have now constituted it, would be made by the frightful means of scientific destruction accumulated on both sides. No one can dream, without sadness of heart, of what war would mean. Besides, all have the conviction that the stake, this time, would be the very existence of France, and that this country would scarcely survive new defeats. The same reasons, too, which cause us to spare nothing for armament, make every one hesitate to desire to employ arms prepared at so great expense.

In the majority of cases, wars are decided, against the will of the people engaged in them, by governments which hope to become absolute by victory. Our present *régime* renders the government completely powerless to make an attempt of this sort. Ministries that succeed each other so swiftly have not enough authority to plunge the country in a conflict against its will. They are in the hand of parliamentary majorities. The hundreds of men who form a legislative body have too little fixity to take an initiative, and a responsibility so weighty: as the changes of universal suffrage alter the character of such a body, it would hold back at once the government that wished to drag the country into such an undertaking. An unfortunate war would be the ruin of all those that had waged it. A single man can confront so doubtful a chance: the parties in the two legislative houses, always hesitating, never will take it. If the Parliament had had any power in 1870, war would never have been declared. Even supposing a majority so audacious as to think of throwing the country into a bloody conflict,—a majority quite unlike all those that we have seen,—it is very doubtful whether it could do so; public opinion, when it is well fixed, being to-day absolutely master. That a French government should be able to attack Germany, either a dictatorship would be necessary, like that of which M. Boulanger dreamed, or the restoration of a monarchy. In either of the two cases, it is quite evident that the new master of France would be obliged to seek in a victory the consolidation of his authority, and to stake all to gain all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But M. Boulanger stranded. The sad end of his adventure, it seems, ought to disgust the candidates for Cæsarism for a long time; and the monarchists themselves have abandoned the hope of a restoration. So long as the present *régime* lasts,—apart from events impossible to foresee, which should affect Germany very seriously,—all thought of aggression on the part of the French Government must be laid aside. Besides, there is in this country an opinion, very widespread and seemingly well founded, that that one of the two nations which puts itself in the wrong by attacking the other will weaken its forces for the contest considerably, from the moral point of view. It will give to the other the *élan* of wrath and the sentiment of right. Each would be unanimous in defence: either would be greatly divided with regard to the opportunity of an attack, and its divisions would weaken it.

The situation, so far as concerns France, offers, then, this double aspect,—that on the one hand all reconciliation between the two nations seems impossible, so long as Alsace-Lorraine shall be German; and that, on the other hand, no one dreams of attacking Germany, though having the thought of conflict always present in his mind. It is not too much to say that this double state of mind is not only general, but that it presents itself almost with the force of unanimity. It is singular, that in the midst of political contests of the greatest asperity,—so great that it seems sometimes as if civil war would break out,—the harmony on these two questions has been almost undisturbed. He would be derided by the whole French public, who should declare the necessity of a reconciliation with the masters of Alsace-Lorraine: he would be none the less disavowed by all, who should raise a cry of war.

What, then, are we waiting for? It would be difficult to say precisely. Gambetta, endeavoring to explain how really pacific intentions were consistent with the constant thought of the lost provinces, spoke one day of hopes which could be left to "the immanent justice" of events, relying thus on the power of right obeyed by destiny. To speak in language less elevated and less metaphysical, it is plainly not impossible, that, in face of a persistent and powerfully armed demand, the course of things may bring about for Germany some such an event, foreign or domestic,—a complication on the eastern frontier, or a political revolution,—as could facilitate a solution; or even that its disgust with a very burdensome situation may enable it to discover one. Many people in France think, as certain foreign newspapers have also said, that our neighbors are less capable than we are of sup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

porting the crushing financial burden made necessary by the hostility of the two nations, and that in time the war of budgets which is now going on will suffice. It is certain that we are so far from being ruined, in spite of annual expenditures of three milliards and a half, that we have been able in recent years to re-establish our financial position, to suppress the deficit, and to reduce considerably the loan budgets, which, if they are continued, will disappear in two or three years, without lessening our military expenditures. Experience seems to have shown that a people, with the present fiscal organizations, can pay with less trouble much heavier taxes when moderate fortunes are more numerous among them. Very great fortunes, with taxes on consumption, taxes on commerce, and even the present form of direct taxes, never pay in proportion to the wealth that they represent. Where, on the one hand, there is an aristocracy or a very wealthy plutocracy, and, on the other, very poor populations, consuming little, and difficult to tax because of their misery, the treasury has much less revenue than where the same total wealth is divided into a great number of moderate competencies. It is probably for this reason that France supports without too much opposition such heavy burdens. Above all, we must not forget that Germany, with a relatively light debt, can still ask for a considerable number of millions in loans, and that she is, from the financial point of view, one of the best administered countries in the world, so that we must not count unduly, perhaps, on this war of budgets. All this permits only one conclusion to be drawn,—that there exists in the heart of modern Europe a cause of conflict greatly to be feared, and that it is impossible to foresee how this cause will disappear. Germany makes continual use of the great influence which the last war gave her to find on all sides allies against us. It may almost be said that from Spain to China there is no state to which she has not addressed herself. How has she succeeded? I do not pretend to be in diplomatic secrets; and I hardly regret it: I believe that that is often one way of deceiving one's self. Situations are more powerful than all the combinations of diplomats. The latter are evanescent: the former remain. It is the situations, then, that we must examine.

She has even attempted to obtain the co-operation of England against us; and it has been plain that at first the attempt was not clearly discouraged: far from it! The party now in power in London is not the friend of France; and it appeared quite satisfied, in return for the difficulties it might have with us in far-away regions, to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to show itself leaning on Germany. · It does not seem, however, that there is any serious danger for us in that quarter. England's interests are all on the side of peace. The pacific movement of commerce is indispensable to her life at every instant: she is preserved by the sea from the shock of European conflicts, and has shown, during all the century, that she does not wish to mingle in them, unless she is directly concerned, as in the Crimean war. Parliament is as sovereign at London in matters of foreign policy as in those of domestic concern. Even, then, if a minister had the most ardent desire to throw his country into the chances of such a war, his success would be very improbable. Besides, a new triumph for Germany might extend her authority over ports such as Antwerp, Flushing, and Rotterdam, permit her to establish her arsenals there, cause the colonial empire of Holland to pass into her hands,—a prospect furnishing our cousins across the Channel with food for reflection. As soon as the emperor of Germany wished to push things a little too far, his friends of the English ministry quickly turned about; and the *fêtes* held in honor of our fleet at Spithead gave the signal for this flank movement. There is every reason to believe, that, in case of war, England would await the results of the conflict.

Among the states bound openly in the Triple Alliance, there is one with which France has only relations of sympathy, and which plainly nourishes against us no animosity: it is Austria-Hungary. The most cordial relations exist habitually between the two countries. The two governments have no reason for fighting, and, if Austria is the ally of Germany, it is, one may say, because this alliance was forced on her. The confused mass of diverse peoples which forms the double empire of Vienna and Pesth is a remnant of the past which each European commotion shakes up dangerously. It is not an easy thing to maintain in the same monarchy ten hostile races, one of which looks toward Berlin, another toward Rome, the others toward St. Petersburg.

Each future event that can put in question the existing state of things is very likely to dissolve this assembly of races gathered with so great pains. What would become of it if Austria had against her such a neighbor as Germany? The neighbor is also her natural defender against Russia, with whom rival ambitions in the direction of Constantinople, and the number of Slavic peoples belonging to the governments of Vienna and Pesth, naturally put Austria in conflict. It is also the only one that can assure her security on the side of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy. Austria cannot, then, quarrel with Germany, but, owing to the same motives, she has the best reasons in the world for keeping out of warlike ventures. Her armies, so valiant and so justly famed, come on the field of battle divided by race quarrels, which were the principal causes of her last reverses, and one defeat might be fatal. Besides, Austria is far from our frontiers; and in case of a European conflict, it is evident that her prejudices would be on the side of Russia.

There is no doubt that the principal means employed by Germany against us is the fear which our republican institutions can inspire among the monarchies that surround us. To be sure, France makes no propaganda beyond her borders: even in the interior, our republic has assumed aspects singularly monarchical. But the Old World plainly moves in the direction of democracy; and the spectacle of one of the great powers of Europe living under a popular government is not calculated to retard a movement which gives all crowned heads something to think about.

It is easy to understand that this consideration has little practical interest for Austria-Hungary, where race problems relegate to the second place those of the form of government, or for Russia, to which it is altogether foreign, owing both to customs and the history of the country. But it is different with our immediate neighbors, whom blood, language, incessant relations, and political questions of the same nature, ally most closely with our own domestic affairs. This is notably the case with Italy, Belgium, and Spain. In these three countries the democratic parties in general sympathize with France, which the monarchical governments view with an evil eye.

It is thus that it has been possible to alienate us from Italy. The Roman question, so much exploited against us, is plainly only a pretext. Not only does Rome as a capital run no serious risk any longer, but it is absurd to suppose that the French Republic, born of the Revolution, would re-establish the power of the Pope. The hostility against France on the other side of the Alps is dynastic, and it is no secret that the various ministers who have borne the apparent responsibility of it have been only the instruments of the king.

The past has created too many bonds between the two countries, and economic interests bind them too closely together, to make it easy to force them into a quarrel. The Tunisian affair has been used to excite jealousies between the two peoples in the Mediterranean basin. It is not too much to think that this was the aim of Bismarck when he so amiably consented to our taking possession of the ruins of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Carthage. Immediately afterward the hand was played out; the most favorable minister toward France that Italy had ever possessed fell under a general hue and cry; and the Italian people was seized with a fit of rage which permitted the weaving of the Triple Alliance.

This has cost Italy dear. In the first place, for her much more than for Germany, the war of budgets has grave consequences. Our transalpine neighbors are bending under the weight of their military expenses. Besides, we were the principal purchasers of their products. You know that commercial rupture, a consequence of political antagonism, has had for the peninsula results truly ruinous. From 1886 to 1890 our importations from Italy fell, according to our customs authorities, from 309,000,000 to 122,000,000 francs. A veritable crash followed, and the ministry hostile to France fell beneath its unpopularity, as you know.

It is quite certain that this has cooled Italy's ardor for the Triple Alliance to such an extent that the renewal of the treaty was a surprise. It is necessary only to wait, however, to see the Italian monarchy array itself against us. It has been of recent years more impatient to crush us than has Germany herself. To what degree can it be held back by public sentiment, or by ministers less bellicose than M. Crispi? It would be very hard to say.

In spite of recent denials, the sentiments of the king of the Belgians are no longer a secret. Confronted with the laboring classes, which are striving to win universal suffrage, he sees himself much more menaced by the democratic movement than the king of Italy; and it is strongly probable that he will resign himself to the position of a sovereign subordinate to the emperor of Germany, like the king of Bavaria or the king of Saxony, to be guaranteed against revolutions.

Truly, he is needed. Germany, in case of war, counts on avoiding our eastern frontier, bristling with fortresses, and on entering our territory by way of Belgium, whose neutrality she will violate: hence this business of the fortifications of the Meuse, built by Belgium on the advice of the Germans, and for their profit; the little monarchy at Brussels not having the necessary forces to prevent Germany from taking possession of them. By good fortune the thing has been discussed in time, and it seems probable that Belgium, caring more for her independence than for her king, will give herself the army she needs to guard against surprise. As for the government of Madrid, a Spanish journal announced recently, on behalf of the court, inten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions similar to those of the Belgian court. It is quite difficult to ascertain the truth in this particular.

It is useless to dwell on the alliance that furnishes a counterpoise to these evil wishes. The *fêtes* at Cronstadt have made too much noise recently to render long comments necessary. What has, perhaps, not been sufficiently said is, that they were only the expression of a position already ancient. It would be equally imprudent for Russia to let France be ruined, and for France to let Russia be ruined. Whichever of the two should allow the power of the other to become paralyzed for a time, would find itself the next day face to face with Germany, more powerful and more threatening than ever. This is so well understood, that when Bismarck, uneasy at our rapid recovery some years after our defeats, wished to finish us before we should be in a condition to defend ourselves, it was chiefly Russia that took our part. The union is less close to-day; but it still exists.

Thus stand alliances, intentions, and sympathies in the Europe of to-day. What will come to pass if a conflict breaks out? What powers will enter the game? Up to what point is it prudent to base predictions on official friendships? It is quite plain that it would be foolhardy to predict any thing. Even where it is well known that signed treaties exist, these treaties promise intervention only on certain conditions, which can be interpreted by each party according to the convenience of the moment. Circumstances of domestic politics yet unknown in the case of each country, would, without doubt, determine the greater or less interest it would have in taking part in the fight. Besides, one circumstance leads us to believe, that, in case of war between France and Germany, alliances would not have all the importance that is attributed to them. it is that these two nations are almost the only ones organized for a rapid mobilization of their land forces. Austria does not seem to be making the expenditures necessary to such an organization, which costs very dear. Russia is obliged to traverse with her troops enormous spaces with insufficient communications. Italy is much hindered by her system of railways, almost entirely single-tracked. The German and French armies, then, would be together before the others could interfere; and the first shock, so often decisive in modern wars, would have taken place when they, in their turn, were ready.

Shall we see this frightful spectacle? Will Germany, according to the intentions often attributed to her young and ambitious sovereign, tire of the present situation, and will she resolve to make the attack?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will the spark that is to set fire to the powder come from the other side of Europe,—from that region of the lower Danube where so many questions hazardous to peace present themselves? Will we continue to face each other, and to wait each for the other, as we have been doing for twenty years? Will some profound popular or social movement, such as is felt continually to be in preparation under the soil of old Europe, come to change and renew the situation before the two countries have joined battle? He would be indeed rash who should try to make arbitrary predictions in this respect. The future remains hidden under a deep obscurity. May it not astonish humanity by the horror of the destructive forces that it shall unchain! May the causes of division among the peoples, and the violence done to their rights, be blotted out without too much blood and devastation!

CAMILLE PELLETAN.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## SHOULD THE SILVER LAW OF 1890 BE REPEALED?

THE Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York at its October meeting passed this resolution:—

"That, in the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, the existing law compelling the purchase by the government of 4,500,000 ounces of silver per month is against the public welfare, and should be repealed."

The resolution was passed practically without debate, discussion, or argument; and a proposition to postpone its consideration to the following meeting, so as to permit preparation for a fuller discussion, was not entertained. It is a sign either of great strength or of great weakness for a body possessing no powers except those of moral suasion, to pass its opinion upon the most momentous question agitating the public mind at the present time, by the simple adoption of a short resolution calling for the repeal of a law which it considers as against the public welfare. Whether or not the expressed opinion of the Chamber of Commerce concerning the silver legislation of 1890 is correct, the public is certainly entitled to know the motives which actuated the passage of so forcible a resolution, touching a subject of the most vital importance, and upon which many diverging views and opinions exist.

In April last the Chamber instructed its committee on finance and currency to report at the October meeting by what measures a depreciation in the currency, as created under existing laws, could be prevented, and what additional legislation would be required to carry such measures into effect. In the argument then made, it was endeavored to show, that, with the feeling prevailing among a large majority of the people, it would be of no avail to attempt at this time a repeal of the law directing the monthly purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver, and that the efforts of those desiring a safe currency should therefore rather be concentrated upon securing legislation by which the government issues of circulating notes could become protected against depreciation in extraordinary times. Such an eventuality, it was suggested, might occur upon a succession of crop failures at times when exports diminish largely, or during periods of speculation and extravagance, when imports become excessive and the balance of trade is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turned against us. It was pointed out that the prevention of any possible depreciation could best be secured through an increase from time to time of the Treasury's stock of gold, so that the latter should always remain in prescribed proportion to the holdings of silver. It was further suggested, that,—although the secretary of the treasury possessed, as was assumed, under the Resumption Act, authority to issue bonds for the purchase of gold,—to remove any doubt upon this point, it should by additional legislation more clearly be made the duty of the secretary to protect the standard of the currency against depreciation. The argument was thus summarized:—

> "This is, then, apparently the practicable solution of the currency question, not to endeavor to attain the impossible,—the repeal of the silver law of 1890,—but to secure supplementary legislation, which shall seek to establish full faith in our desire and ability to protect the standard of our currency."

Since the foregoing argument was made, and the finance committee of the Chamber of Commerce instructed to report measures by which a depreciation in the currency, as created under existing laws, could be prevented, the President of the United States has publicly declared in unmistakable terms, that the government was in honor and by law bound to uphold and protect the standard of the currency, so that any dollar issued by it should always be as good as any other dollar. This declaration by the Federal Executive, recently further fortified by public utterances of the secretary of the treasury, must be taken as an official declaration, not only that existing laws are mandatory in their direction to uphold the standard, but also of the sufficiency of such laws, and that they will, if the situation requires, be carried into effect. These high assurances certainly justified the recommendation of the finance committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce, in view of a situation so considerably changed from that existing in the early spring, to defer action for the time being.

After the Federal Executive had emphatically declared that existing laws were sufficient to protect the currency against a depreciation, the committee of the Chamber of Commerce could hardly have taken the position that such was not the case. For reasons, however, which were not entirely made clear, and altogether ignoring the instructions which it had given to its committee, which solely called for the report of measures by which a depreciation in the currency "as created under existing laws" could be prevented, the Chamber summarily took the entire matter out of the hands of its committee, and, without further

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discussion or argument, declared "that, in its opinion, the existing law compelling the monthly purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver was against the public welfare, and that the same should be repealed."

Let us examine whether this opinion and the demand based thereon are justified under prevailing conditions. Our circulating medium is composed of these note issues: the so-called greenback currency, of which there are outstanding $346,000,000; national bank-note currency, of which there are about $124,000,000 yet in circulation; gold certificates, $140,000,000; silver certificates issued under the Act of 1878, amounting to $325,000,000; and the treasury coin notes created by the Act of 1890, of which there have been issued to date about $65,000,000, and which are increased monthly by about $5,000,000.

Had the silver legislation of 1878 and 1890 not been enacted, our circulating medium would at this time consist solely of the $346,000,000 greenback currency, the $140,000,000 gold certificates, and the $124,000,000 national bank-notes; the latter steadily diminishing in volume, until they must necessarily go out of existence within a comparatively short space of time. Thus, with a population which since 1878 has increased some twelve millions or more, we should have at this time—without the issues made under the laws of 1878 and 1890, and taking into consideration both the decrease which has taken place in the volume of the national bank-notes since 1878, and the increase in gold certificates—a paper currency some $470,000,000 smaller in volume than in 1878, when there were outstanding about $20,000,000 gold certificates and $324,000,000 national bank-notes. Of the latter we are certain to lose a further $124,000,000 within the next sixteen years through the final disappearance of the national debt, while during the same period our population is likely to increase from fifteen millions to twenty millions.

How, then, should we be situated to-day, and what would have become of our commerce and industry, if our circulating medium were to remain limited to the $346,000,000 greenbacks, the reduced issues of the national banks, and the certificates issued upon deposit of gold? Should we not have passed from spasm to spasm, from one commercial crisis to another? Would not many of our merchants have become bankrupt, and commerce, trade, and industry have become paralyzed? And, even if at this time the Act of 1890 were to be repealed, would not—with the certainty of a contraction through the decrease in the national bank-note circulation, and an increasing population—a similar state of disaster ere long be upon us?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With all this, no sound economist can defend the creation of a circulating medium resting upon a foundation smaller in value than the face of the currency represents; and, measured by sound economic principles, the passage of the law of 1878, directing the coinage of silver dollars of a debased intrinsic value, and the creation of certificates based upon this coinage, was indefensible. Fortunately, the law of 1890 has practically stopped this coinage, and it can scarcely be denied that the treasury notes which the latter law authorizes are, from an economic point of view, vastly more desirable than the silver certificates created by the law of 1878. Had the law made these treasury coin notes redeemable either in silver bullion at its market-value, or in gold at the option of the government, the possible danger of a depreciation would have been removed. As it is, we shall have to be dependent upon a safe construction of the letter of the law, such as the present administration appears willing to put upon it, to protect us against a depreciation in the standard.

It is evident, that even with the best intentions upon the part of the present administration and its successors, unless the government's stock of gold is increased with the growth of the volume of its coin notes, the time must come when we shall have to suffer for the economic mistakes now being persisted in; but even this danger-point, considering the tremendous and yet unknown absorbing power of, and the enormous area covered by, this country, is probably farther off than is supposed by many. Whenever the danger-line shall be reached, and gold begins to command a premium, it is most unlikely that our people will for a considerable length of time again accept a depreciated currency, and we shall then be compelled to shoulder the cost, and pay dearly for our present mistaken financial policy. The continuance of this policy, with the prevailing economic tendencies of a large majority of our people, is, however, unavoidable. Every thing points to the probability, that, until actual facts shall prove the mistakes we are making, no law can be passed materially improving prevailing methods. These mistakes once established, the remedy will be sought, and even at great cost it will be found and applied. But even this appears preferable to a situation which would sooner or later be created, were the Act of 1890 repealed without first devising a substitute for the circulating notes which it authorizes.

To find a substitute which shall satisfy the demands of sound finance, and to endeavor to form public opinion until it shall become educated to safe economic principles, is therefore the duty of the hour.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government issues of currency in every form are in themselves unsound, for a sound circulating medium must be based upon and move with actual production; and since government does not produce any thing, neither should it have the power to create any other than a metallic currency of full international value. A sound currency must be elastic, expand and contract with the requirements of commerce and industry,—a function which no government note issue can perform. The function to furnish commerce and industry with the necessary circulation properly belongs to the banks, which alone are in a position to fulfil all the requirements by compliance with which the basis for a sound paper currency can alone be established.

It is not the purpose of the present article to develop a plan upon which a sound and satisfactory banking currency might be created, but rather to point out the measures which should precede a repeal of the existing silver legislation. Unfortunately it is more than doubtful whether a majority of our people are at this time prepared to grant new privileges to the banks; but those in whose power it lies, and whose duty it is to educate public opinion, should first direct their energies to the economic education of our people, until the unjustified hostility to the banks, for which no good motive exists, shall cease, rather than suggest measures which, even were they attainable, would be fraught with danger, and might cause disaster. For the present, and until a safe and satisfactory substitute can be found for our fast disappearing bank-note circulation, a repeal *in toto* of the silver legislation of 1890 does not appear desirable, though its modification is imperative.

Legislation should be obtained making treasury notes redeemable in silver bullion at its market-value, or in gold at the option of the government, upon the plan proposed by the late Secretary Windom, while a minimum gold reserve should by law be established, in prescribed proportion to the Treasury's stock of silver; so that in any event the government shall be at all times in a position to protect the standard of all its note issues.

To demand, as has been done, an immediate repeal of the existing law, without pointing out or even discussing economic measures to be enacted preceding a repeal, will not only lead to naught, but is likely to create sectional feeling and distrust. It would be like withdrawing from a patient the sustaining medicine, permitting him to sink near unto death, before discussing and endeavoring to find the relief measures through which it would become possible to effect a permanent cure.

JACOB H. SCHIFF.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## A PLAN FOR A PERMANENT BANK SYSTEM.

MR. HARTER'S "Plan for a Permanent Bank System" (in the October FORUM) calls for respectful attention. Security for bank-notes is the one thing which the public will insist upon, and ought to insist upon. This must not be pretty good security, but absolutely good, or as good as the government itself. Mr. Harter proposes that all parts of the national banking system shall stand, except as to the things deposited by the banks to secure the government against loss. As the law now stands, the government assumes all responsibility for the outstanding bank-notes, and redeems them on presentation, whether the banks are solvent or insolvent. If the banks are solvent, the government looks to a certain fund, known as the "Five Per Cent Redemption Fund," for the means to pay them: if insolvent, it looks to the deposited bonds, which it can sell in the open market if necessary. These being its own bonds, its liabilities are not at all increased by assuming responsibility for all the bank-notes outstanding.

Of course, there must be limits even to this kind of responsibility, because it would be very inconvenient for the government to be called on to redeem, say, two hundred millions of failed bank-notes suddenly, —just as inconvenient as it would be to redeem that amount of bonds unexpectedly. We know that such a condition is about as unlikely to happen as a return of Noah's flood. What makes it unlikely is the fact that the national banking system is *good*, that the capital is real and not bogus, that inspections and published reports are frequent, and that the examiners (in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred) and the supervising officers in Washington are capable and honest.

The more I examine this law and the longer I watch its operations, the greater is my admiration for it and my respect for those who framed it. Of course, it was not made all at once. It is an evolution and a growth: it could never have fitted us as it does, if it had been otherwise. Those who worked over it, and hammered at it from time to time, were intent upon nothing else than making a good banking system. Time revealed defects now and then. Careful watchers saw opportunity for improvement here and there. The busybodies, fortu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nately, had their attention fixed upon the war and reconstruction. They did not attempt to meddle with things that they did not understand. Consequently, the voice of the demagogue was not heard, and his hand was not felt until a late period in the history of the law. When he made his appearance in financial legislation, the march of improvement came to an end: that of deterioration began. But the mischief done has been slight up to this time, having been held in check by the ignorance of those whose intention was to discredit and destroy the system.

As Mr. Harter's plan does not change that part of the existing law which makes the government responsible for the redemption of bank-notes, the question before us is, How shall the government be secured after its own bonds are paid off and extinguished? A word may be put in here touching the plan of issuing government bonds expressly as security for national bank-notes. This plan is inadmissible both economically and politically. It is barred economically, because it proposes that the government shall borrow money that it has no use for, and shall tax the people to pay interest on such borrowings forever. The "general welfare" clause of the Constitution is very elastic, but it can hardly be stretched to cover that case. The plan is barred politically, because the people in their present temper will not consent to it. This is a case where the popular instinct coincides with right principles.

How shall the government be secured after its own bonds are no longer available? I consider that the government's responsibility has become a *sine qua non* of national bank-notes. The national banking system, minus circulating notes, may last to the end of time, and perform a most useful office; but, if we are to have notes at all, they must be so good that no holder of them will ever ask a question or entertain a doubt about them, or even look to see what particular bank it is whose notes he holds.

Mr. Harter's proposal looks primarily to certain stock exchange securities, put in pledge to protect the government, taking the place of its own bonds; but of course it does not overlook the additional security represented by the bank's capital. The principal objection to this class of securities is, that they might become a part of the political dispensation, so that bonds of this or that kind would be "urged" upon the comptroller or the secretary by his party friends. This was at one time a powerful objection in my own mind; but, with the restrictions as to market-value and dividend payments (to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hereafter noted), the danger would be very slight. If influence and pressure can be eliminated, Mr. Harter's plan becomes a question of the goodness of certain specified securities. Let us look at these *seriatim*:—

1st, State bonds of certain defined types. I think that all State bonds ought to be excluded for two reasons: first, because the States cannot be sued in case of default; and, second, because the discretion which ought to be allowed to the secretary of the treasury to reject any bond, at any time, for any reason satisfactory to himself, could not be practically exercised as against a State. Thus, the secretary might be convinced in his own mind that a State would default on some class of bonds issued by it, although it never had defaulted. In that case he ought to be at liberty to require any bank that had that class of bonds on deposit to substitute other security. But to do so on mere suspicion would be to attack the credit of a State and the honor of all its citizens. No secretary could be expected to do that. The case is quite different with any bonds of inferior dignity.

2d, County bonds representing a debt of not over four dollars, and city bonds representing a debt of not over eight dollars, per inhabitant; all bonds to be listed on some stock exchange, and not to have ever been in default, and not to have sold below par during five years. This seems quite unobjectionable; but I think that very few of this description of bonds would ever reach the National Treasury. Nearly all city bonds are outside of the limits named as regards the proportion of debt to population. New York has outstanding, and exclusive of her sinking-fund, $65 per inhabitant, Boston $70, Philadelphia $24, Chicago $13, Brooklyn $47, Buffalo $38, St. Louis $42, Cincinnati (including her Southern railroad debt) $82. So we should not expect much re-enforcement from that quarter.

3d, Mortgage bonds of dividend-paying railroads other than street-railroads. The same requirements as to listing, etc., apply as to county and city bonds. Here, probably, we should find the bulk of our security. A provision is added, that if the railroad ceases to pay dividends, or if its bonds fall below 105 in the market, the bank depositing them shall be required to deposit others fulfilling the requirements of the law. Provisions of law analogous to these exist in the State of New York, respecting the investments of trust companies. It is provided that the bonds shall be registered, and shall be payable in gold.

It would be an improvement upon Mr. Harter's proposal to give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the comptroller of the currency, with the approval of the secretary of the treasury, power to reject any securities, and to throw out any, for any reason satisfactory to himself. It often happens that coming events in the financial world cast their shadows before. Those persons who are gifted with the power to discern them, get rid of the suspected securities in time. The government should reserve to itself an equal privilege. Moreover, we can conceive of a manufacture of securities, and a rigging of the market, expressly for the purposes of bank-circulation. The Cincinnati, Hamilton, and Dayton Railroad affair, which deceived the very elect, is a case in point.

Are there any other securities available than those named? Mr. Harter does not mention any other. I agree with him, that real-estate mortgages are not available for this purpose. The reasons why they are not are too numerous to mention. Nor do I see any other form of security available. Probably these are sufficient in amount for the purpose. Are they sufficient in point of goodness?

We must bear in mind first, that the banks themselves will be more interested than anybody else in putting up good securities, and in keeping them good, because any resulting loss will fall upon them. The government's remedy is not exhausted by a sale of the security bonds. It comes down upon the bank's capital and assets for any deficiency, and it can, if it chooses, give itself a first lien upon the assets to the extent of the unredeemed notes. This would not be unfair. But the government has still other means of reimbursement. It can convert the present tax on bank-notes into a safety-fund for all failed bank-notes, and can invest this fund in the same class of securities as the deposited bonds. Finally, there is still another resource, i.e., the personal liability of the bank's shareholders. Each one is liable for a sum equal to the amount of his stock, in addition to the property which the stock represents.

So we have four strings to our bow; viz.,—

1. The bonds deposited as security.
2. The bank's capital.
3. A common safety-fund (if desired) accumulated from the tax on bank-notes.
4. The shareholders' personal liability.

Is anybody prepared to say that this is not sufficient? Probably the most competent critics will affirm that the clauses numbered 2, 3, and 4, are sufficient without No. 1; and a very strong argument can be made to that effect, drawn from the statistics of bank-failures

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the past twenty-five years. But probably Congress would not consent to such an innovation.

I grant, that, if the note-holders were to be thrown into panic by bank-failures, the plan would be very questionable, because sometimes securities decline very rapidly in the market. One brick knocks down another, and presently the whole row is flat on the ground. But, if the government backs all the notes, no note can ever be discredited, however much the securities may decline. There will not be an extra note presented for payment in any panic. Very likely, notes would be hoarded in such a case, as Bank of England notes have been at such times. The question is only of securing the government. There is no doubt whatever, that the security enumerated above is ample.

Mr. Harter proposes that the present discriminating tax on the circulating notes of state banks shall be repealed, provided such notes are secured in precisely the same manner by bonds deposited by the auditor or treasurer of the State, and provided, also, that the State shall guarantee the payment of its circulating notes. This provision seems to me objectionable. In the first place, it introduces possibly forty-seven different varieties of bank-notes,—different as to form and as to goodness also. The guaranty of Mississippi, for example, would be held in much less esteem than that of Ohio. On the other hand, the guaranty of the United States would be held in higher esteem than that of any one State. It is very undesirable to have *variety* re-introduced into money after it has been once, and with much difficulty, expelled. The war rid us of slavery and of state bank-notes,—good riddances both! Let us not invite the return of either. Mr. Harter's reasons for opening the door to state bank-notes are thus given:—

> "This would, in every State where there was a demand for it, restore state banking to its old condition of usefulness, and would silence the now well-founded charge that national banks enjoy an exclusive and therefore special privilege,—that of issuing circulating notes."

I do not see the force of these reasons. A bank calling itself "state bank" is required to do all the things, in the way of securing its notes, that another bank in the same town, called "national bank," is required to do; or, if there is any laxity in favor of the former (as in supervision, or examination, or personal liability of shareholders), it is in the direction of greater facilities for swindling the community. This door will always be open wide enough, do what we may.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And is the charge that the national banks enjoy an exclusive and special privilege well founded? To establish this, it must be shown that somebody is denied a privilege which is open to others. This, I apprehend, cannot be shown. It is well known that the comptroller of the currency is exerting himself all the time to bring new banks into the system. His report for 1890 shows that 307 came into existence during the year. The doors were not closed to any who were willing to conform to the law. Conformance to the law is not a special privilege, but non-conformance would be.

The demand for state bank-notes comes, not from those who want to put up the same security as the national banks, but from those who do not want to put up any security at all. They are honest men. They do not intend to defraud anybody. They have the Scotch bank system in their mind's eye. Whether that system—with its unlimited liability of shareholders, its uniformity of local law, and its small, compact territory—is adaptable to our wide continent and our diverse State laws and practice, is extremely doubtful, but, at any rate, is not relevant to this discussion.

What is to be done in case a State treasurer makes away with the securities committed to him? There are some modern instances of this kind. Then the State must make good its guaranty; but when? The States do not usually keep a surplus of cash on hand for such contingencies. Of course, the notes would depreciate while the State was providing itself with funds to make good its pledge, and most likely a special session of the Legislature would be necessary. Then, suppose that the Legislature should not make an appropriation. The State may guarantee the notes; but who will guarantee the State? Even the State of Minnesota was rescued from the disgrace of repudiation, only by a decision of its Supreme Court, ten years ago.

But this branch of the subject is in no way essential to the plan we are considering. I have said enough to show, that in my judgment Mr. Harter's proposal as regards the national banks, with some not serious modification and amendment, would be quite safe.

HORACE WHITE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## BANK-NOTE CIRCULATION—MR. HARTER'S PLAN.

THE money or circulating medium of a country usually consists of gold and silver coin and paper currency. The great bulk of business is conducted on credit. Transactions are made by debits and credits on books of account, by promissory notes, bills of exchange on time and demand, bank-checks, etc. As a rule, only balances, or differences between debit and credit transactions, are settled in money; and international settlements are usually made in gold or silver. In other words, by common consent, gold or silver are considered equivalent for all other property at such prices as may be agreed upon between the parties who make the transactions. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the circulating medium used be redeemable in gold or silver, and interchangeable at par, in order to conduct business upon a proper and stable basis; and any plan which contemplates a change in our circulating medium should be carefully considered before being indorsed or adopted.

The plan of Mr. Michael D. Harter, published in the October FORUM, suggests a radical change from our present system. It is entitled "A Plan for a Permanent Bank System;" but the ordinary functions of banks of deposit and discount are not discussed, the plan considering only the issue of bank-notes on the security of state, municipal, and railway bonds. No provision is made in his plan to restrict the aggregate amount of notes issued, and without restriction the volume of bank-note currency would soon be so inflated that redemption would be impossible. This of itself would appear to be an insurmountable objection to his plan.

The national banking system, which was organized in February, 1863, has furnished for many years a most excellent paper currency, secured by deposit of government bonds with the treasurer of the United States; and the bank-notes are issued under such careful provisions of law, that the general public scarcely realize that they are simply promises to pay, and not money. The national bank-notes are redeemable in legal-tender notes, which, in turn, are redeemable in coin, and for many years have been as perfect a circulating medium

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it is possible for a bank-note to be. The redemption and the payment of the debt of the United States, however, has progressed so far, that government bonds can no longer be used as a basis of circulation with profit. The gradual reduction of interest on the public debt, and its redemption, have for many years called attention to the fact, that, if bank-notes are to be used in the United States as any considerable part of our currency, some other basis or security must be found. Many plans have been suggested; but so far none has been acceptable to the general public or to Congress. In the mean time the government itself has provided the people with a paper currency, based upon deposits of gold and silver, that has at all times been interchangeable, and well suited for business needs. The issue of currency by the government, however, has been criticised on the theory that it is dangerous prerogative, and that no legislation can provide for a government issue of money which will be flexible enough for the needs of business; i.e., such an issue does not meet the well-known necessity of an increase or diminution of currency suitable for the fluctuation of business. It is necessary, during certain periods of each year, that a large amount of currency from the various centres should be distributed throughout the country, in order to make advances on maturing crops, and for other purposes. At other seasons, the return flow of currency to the centres makes it possible for our business to be properly and safely conducted with a less volume of currency outstanding. For these and other reasons, it is believed that bank-notes should form a large part of the circulation of the country, on the theory that notes can be issued when needed, and redeemed when they have performed their function. Therefore, the fundamental principle underlying a bank-note is its redemption when desired. For obvious reasons, coin cannot be used as a basis for bank-note circulation. No profit would accrue to a bank putting out notes against coin; and this method would not provide additional currency, as coin can at any time be used as money.

Next to gold and silver, the debt of a sound government is universally considered the best basis for circulation, as government bonds can be readily converted, and the bank-notes redeemed from their proceeds.

Mr. Harter suggests that the National Bank Act be taken as a basis of his plan for "a permanent banking system," and also suggests that banks organized under the laws of the several States should be permitted to issue notes. This would not be feasible, as notes issued

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under national authority would undoubtedly be considered safer by the general public than those issued under state authority, and consequently the notes would not be interchangeable at par.

It is obvious that the redemption of notes at the counter of the bank only, as suggested in the plan, would be a great inconvenience to the general public, and would result in higher rates of domestic exchange. Under our present currency system, remittances and collections are made throughout the United States at a nominal charge; whereas, it will be remembered that under the old system of bank-note issues, redeemable at the bank only, exorbitant rates of exchange prevailed.

It is generally conceded that the excellence of the national banking system is largely due to its being conducted under the direction of the General Government; and, undoubtedly, national banks will continue to exist as banks of deposit and discount, whether or not they issue circulation. The continued growth of the system demonstrates that national banks are no longer organized for purposes of circulation, but in order to obtain the credit of a national organization. National bank-notes, being secured by a deposit of government bonds, are guaranteed by the government itself. This is reasonable, as the issue is but ninety per cent of the par value of the bonds; and the least the government can do is to pay its own debt at par. But it would be dangerous and unwise for the United States to guarantee bank-notes secured by the debt of states, municipalities, or railway corporations, as suggested by Mr. Harter. Such guaranty might lead to national complications, if the bonds of states or municipalities, deposited to secure circulation, should default either in principal or interest.

The suggestion that state, municipal, and railway securities be used as a basis of circulation, has been made by several writers on this subject during the past decade; but such securities are not considered available by those who have given the subject most careful attention. It is possible that bonds issued by some of the older states and cities, where the constitution and statutes provide safeguards as to excessive issues, might be available as a basis of circulation; but each and every State can change its constitution, and statutory restrictions and regulations relating to bond issues, and this is also the case with municipalities: therefore it would be impossible to make selections of state, city, and county bonds whose value could be depended upon with certainty. The *per capita* restriction, as suggested by Mr. Harter, would be no safeguard against issues of bonds altogether out of pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portion to the taxable property of a State or district. An aggregate debt of "two dollars for each of its citizens" might be excessive in one State, and possibly not a burden in another. Prior to the passage of the National Bank Act, notes were issued in some States, secured by State bonds; and it is well known that heavy losses were sustained by bank-note holders through the repudiation of the bonds of several States. The suggestion of Mr. Harter—that the circulation of banks might be guaranteed by States—would be of little consequence, as such guaranty could, upon the slightest pretext, be repudiated. It is doubtful, moreover, if such a guaranty would be valid.

The use of railway-bonds would be much more dangerous than the use of state or municipal securities. Railway-bonds are issued without statutory restriction or regulation; and the frequent re-organization of railway corporations during the past ten or fifteen years, indicates that very many of the railways in the United States have been and are bonded for larger sums than their cost of construction or value will warrant. Railway construction in this country is not so expensive as formerly, and very likely many of the railway-bonds now outstanding will be scaled down, both principal and interest; and the mere listing of such securities, and the fact that they have not been in default for non-payment of interest for five years, would not be conclusive as to their value: these and the other safeguards suggested by Mr. Harter are entirely insufficient to warrant the issue of bank-notes on such a basis.

If the people of this country become dissatisfied with the paper currency now issued by the government, based upon a deposit of gold and silver coin and silver bullion, and conclude that the use of bank-notes as money will be for the best interests of the country (which from present indications is very doubtful), the National Bank Act could probably be amended so that bank-notes might be issued to a certain percentage of the capital of each bank; such notes to be a first lien upon the assets of the bank, and thus secured, directly or indirectly, by promissory notes, time bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt created by mercantile and commercial transactions having but a short time to run. The proceeds of such transactions would provide funds for the bank to retire its notes from time to time, and, when the increase of business required additional circulation, the expansion of credits would furnish to a certain extent the requisite security. In addition to the note being a first lien on the assets of the bank, and secured as stated, a safety fund might be accumulated by an annual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tax on circulation—to be collected, and retained in the National Treasury—to be used as a redemption fund in case of disaster to individual banks. A careful examination of the statutes under which bank-notes are issued in England, France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Canada, and other countries, indicates that the issues which are most flexible and stable are such as last suggested,—a first lien on the assets of the bank, and so forth. Bank-notes should not be used as money in any country, unless the aggregate amount of issue is restricted, the notes perfectly secured, and their redemption, when desired, absolutely certain. Past experience has shown conclusively that bank-notes ought to be issued under the supervision of the General Government rather than of the several States.

HENRY W. CANNON.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THOUGHTS ABOUT EDUCATION.

It is with no light heart that I act on the wish of the editor that I should set down my experience of education as now carried on in the Old World. I cannot forget that I have had to take part in education in one form or other for nearly forty years; that I have been responsible for the education of sons of my own; that I have for years past joined in the discussions and conferences on this question: and now I feel at times that we are further off the right path than ever, as if our whole system were a failure. There are hours when I feel about education nothing but this,—wipe it out, and let us begin it all afresh.

It has long been a favorite idea of mine that many things work delightfully for good whilst they are spontaneous and unorganized; but when they are stereotyped into an elaborate art, and evolve a special profession or trade of experts, they produce unexpected failures, and end in more harm than good. Holidays, excursions, exhibitions, authorship, preaching, temperance,—a thousand good things and virtuous gifts,—end in monster jubilees, world fairs, book-making, pulpit-trading, fanatical tyranny, and other invasions of peace and freedom. And few things suffer more than education by passing into stereotyped schemes set forth in the formulas of the day, and expounded by professional experts. A uniform system of education is a form of madness akin to a project for making men of one size or one weight.

After forty years or so I am coming round to think that the less we systematize education, dogmatize about it, even talk about it, the better. A good education is a general mental and moral condition, like a virtuous nature and a healthy body; and we are all treating it as if it were a special art or a technical craft, and could be taught like playing the violin, or tested like jumping. There is no test of a good education, and no specific for making a young mind active and full. Minds are far more various than physical constitutions, and infinitely more subtle. Education, in a true and high sense, implies the development of the mind to its perfection in a natural and complete manner; and yet, whilst every one can see the quackery involved in any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

art of universal health, we are still multiplying examinations, educational boards, syllabi, schemes, and royal roads to the making of fine minds.

If there is one thing on which all the great reformers of man's social life have insisted more than another, it is the essential unity of *education*, in its moral, mental, and active side, and the hopelessness of trying to build up a truly organic *education* out of many kinds of merely sectional *instruction*. It is like seeking to cure a case of nervous collapse by drugs. All real philosophers tell us that man is a complex, subtle, but single organism, which we can no more take to pieces and treat in segments than we can cut up his body. If there be such things as morality and religion, and if any thing can be said or done by way of inculcating them, or applying them to life, then education cannot be severed from morality and religion, and all real education must be inspired by religion as well as morality. Yet here we all are vowing that religion shall not meddle with education, and that morality belongs to a set of influences quite apart from schools and universities.

No one will suspect me of sighing for the old exclusive religious tests of orthodoxy, or of wishing to see our academies reformed on the pattern of a Jesuit college. I am not likely to forget that for me and for mine no place would be found in any theological seminary. I recognize the necessity, therefore, as things stand, of eliminating religion from our secular education; and, as I do not understand what systematic morality can mean if it have no religious direction at all, I am bound to recognize further that the moral part in our current scholastic systems has to be of a very formal, general, and simple kind. But since, in a truly normal education, religion is the very essence of noble work, and since morality apart from religion is a rattling of dry bones, all that we can do in education must be mere provisional makeshift.

We ask too much from education, we make too much of it, we monstrously over-organize it, and we cruelly overload it. Education can do for us infinitely less than we have come to expect; and what little it can do, is on the condition that it be left simple, natural, and free. I have known very few men who were made into any thing great entirely by their education; and I have known a good many who were entirely ruined by it, and were finally turned out as pedants, prigs, or idiots. Struggling to win prizes in examination, thinking always about the style current to-day, being put through the regula-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion mill, and poring over some little corner of knowledge for some material object—may give a one-sided appearance of learning with nothing behind it, will turn out mechanical eccentricities like calculating-machines, may change an honest fellow into a selfish, dull brute, or leave a weak brain softened and atrophied for life. And the more we organize education, the greater is the risk of our finding this result.

All that education can really give is this: it can supply the opportunities of self-culture; hold forth new standards and ideals to aim at; it can bring the budding mind into contact with a formed and mature mind; shed over the young spirit the inspiring glow of some rare and beautiful intelligence. It can open to the learner the door into the vestibule of the great Library of the World's Wisdom; but it cannot cram its contents into his brain. It can show him a superior intellect in the act of collecting and distilling his materials. It can suggest, explain, correct, and guide in a very general and occasional way; but it cannot teach vigorous thinking, or thrust coherent knowledge into a raw mind, as a plough-boy can with trouble be taught to write, or to remember the multiplication-table. The "three Rs," the merely mechanical instruments of education, may be thus rammed in by sheer labor (perhaps they must be so taught). But when we speak of "education," we are here meaning the higher training professed to be given in the superior colleges and schools. And in these it is often a cruel injury to a moderate or dull mind to have scraps of "prepared" information, and peptonized decoctions of science, hammered into its cells, or to have essays, poems, and systems of philosophy, "wrung," as Milton says, "like blood from the nose."

The ideal education (as imagined, for instance, in the academies of Plato and Aristotle) would be such that a body of students, attracted by a great love of knowledge, should gather from time to time round some great teacher, till they had touch of his informing mind, grasped his method of thought, felt inspiration from his typical ideas, asked of him questions, and answered his questions to them; and then freely went their own way to work out for themselves his suggestions, and left him free to think, to observe, experiment, or write, until he was again ready to teach. Here is a creative mind lighting up other nascent minds, whom a sense of duty, and religious eagerness to behold the face of the great goddess Truth, have freely gathered together in the common desire to develop fitly each his own most diverse nature. That is an ideal education; though we all admit it is impracticable and impossible in the days of our nineteenth century.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What a gulf separates this from the actual education that we see and admire! No academic grove, but a barrack with regiments drilled like Prussian guards, every man of the whole five hundred or thousand polishing up the same lines, translating the same author, filling up every hour of the day with the same monotonous task, anxious about the next inspection, and eager to win promotion by rigid punctuality, and mechanical precision in drill. And the master and philosopher himself is now a drill sergeant, bound to repeat the regulation lesson, to exact minute discipline in thoughts, himself worn into a machine by eternal inspections, examinations, and formal observance of regimental orders. He, poor man, neither thinks nor observes; he neither judges his pupils in his mind, nor pretends to put them in touch with his own. He analyzes, digests, serves out, and compels the repetition of the particular book or scheme of inquiry that for the moment is in vogue in his particular academy. It is not for him to think: he has to repeat. He has to tell his pupils what the favorite authority in history, philosophy, or science, has said in his last book, and to see which of his pupils repeats the lesson with the greatest accuracy. Tons of written answers have to be "marked" each week or month; and the teacher is concerned, not with pupils, but with "papers." As if the repetition of what some learned man has written were knowledge, or as if the being drilled into uniformity by a dozen regulation tutors were the same thing as being inspired by the free suggestions of one powerful mind.

No one denies that drill is good in its place, for certain purposes; and so is discipline, punctuality, and rigid order. It all has fine moral uses for many natures; it can turn out troopers, artillerymen, and able seamen; and a dockyard, a factory, or a fire-brigade would be failures without it. But the question now is, if it can equally well educate minds, characters, imaginations, and hearts; whether we may not, in the spiritual and intellectual spheres, overdo the discipline, the uniformity, and the formal task. The question is, if young natures may not be stunted thereby, and growing brains choked, inflated, or sterilized. Yet, having carried our modern education to the highest point of elaboration and pressure that flesh and blood can sustain, we keep on calling for a still more intricate set of regulations and for more professional experts (as the jargon has it), more incorrigible "educationists."

What is the reason for all this? for our age is neither perverse nor foolish, and reason there must be at bottom. The reason for our practice goes very deep down, and takes us into the spiritual founda-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of human society. But then education must go deep down, and is akin to the innermost soul of social phenomena. The reason for our practice, I hold to be, that education must normally rest on moral and religious motives, and is inextricably bound up with our ideals of duty in life, and our sense of the place of the individual in the world around him. We all admit that we are now hopelessly divided and in doubt about moral and religious ideals, about the motives to do our duty and our conception of man's present and future, in our reading of the voice of Providence and our estimate of a noble life. And, being so hopelessly divided into a thousand schools of opinion, we are resolved to rest education on purely intellectual bases, to surround it with material and pecuniary motives, to limit it "to what will pay," and to what we can bring to the visible test of "marks" by the first two rules of arithmetic.

It is to be hoped that the New World may be spared some of the evils which so fatally trammel education in the Old World. Some of the social and historic sources of these evils are peculiar to Europe, and unknown on the western side of the Atlantic. In England, at least, education has to be organized on almost rigid social strata; lower-class, middle-class, upper-class schools, being strictly divided according to the wealth and social position of families. No "gentleman" ever enters an "elementary" school; no workingman ever enters a "public school," as by an ingenuous euphemism the exclusive seminaries of the rich are still described. And if a middle-class, or "commercial" school, be not absolutely closed by expense or convention to the poor or to the rich, the rare and casual exceptions are not enough to break the rule that "intermediate education" means the teaching of the lower middle-class which are not artisans and are not called "gentry." I am not prepared to say how this could be altered at once in such a country as England with its ancient and complex social conventions, habits, and hierarchy. But it is still true that to graduate education, from the age of nine to that of twenty-one, into strict ranks of the rich, the comfortable, and the poor, is to poison education in its roots, and from a social and moral point of view to make it an instrument for corrupting the mind. It was not so when there was a true education, in the ancient world or in the midde ages. And the bare idea of dispensing knowledge by castes or in money grades would have scandalized Socrates, Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, Epictetus and Plutarch, to say nothing of St. Bernard, Aquinas, Dante, and Petrarch.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Having got all wrong by this fundamental sin of apportioning out education to "gentlemen," to tradesmen, and to artisans, in the "public school," the commercial "academy," and the board school, all kinds of evils have been generated and increased. Pride of caste forces those who aspire to the term of "gentlemen," the governing class, which monopolizes commissions in army and navy, the superior grades of the public service, the Church of England, and the learned professions—pride of caste forces them to cling to a "classical" education in its old pedantic form, the quoting of Latin without false quantities, and the writing of doggerel in Greek or Latin verses. I remember a lad at a public school who spent a weary afternoon over one Latin hexameter. This was the result,—

"Cantabo laudes Martis, Venerīsquĕ lascīvaē."

At some of the most successful schools in England, boys spend whole terms in hammering out disgusting nonsense like this, before they have read a single classical author, or can construe a page of Ovid and Virgil. A few of the boys are clever enough to catch the trick of longs and shorts, just as child gymnasts learn to balance themselves on the trapeze and the tight-rope; and these infant phenomena grow up to win prizes, scholarships, and honors, and turn into ignorant and shallow men. So far from this mental gymnastic in parrot-like imitation of the classical authors conducing to a love of ancient literature, it is my firm belief that the high-pressure system of composition pot-hunting destroys all real interest and knowledge of the great works of antiquity. Many a brilliant scholar has never opened Polybius or Strabo, Theophrastus or Plutarch, and the day after his last examination he is anxious to be rid of his classics along with his battered cap and his ragged gown.

I have so often already tried to point out the essential vices of the examination system, that I will not return to it, save to say, that, the more I see of it, the more do I feel that it is ruining education altogether. Mechanical examination never can test any knowledge worth having: all that it can do is to debase and pervert education. The pupil has before him an end, which is not knowledge or mental culture of any kind, but success, money, applause, and superiority. The teacher has before him, not the improvement of his pupils' minds, but their "fitness" for the race; and those who set the papers (often the scurviest professional hacks) practically order the teacher what he has to teach. There are no doubt some ideal forms of examination which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might be made fair tests of knowledge; as if a thoroughly competent teacher were left free to judge not more than a dozen or a score of students, and had a week or two and a free head to go about it in his own way. But this we know is impracticable. There is no time; it would be too costly; and we will not trust any one's impartiality. When we speak of academic examinations, we mean five hundred students writing like stenographers for four or five days, at six hours *per diem;* the papers being "marked" mechanically under severe pressure by three or four overworked experts who never saw the pupils before, and are forced to pass or pluck them as a barrack surgeon does recruits.

The source of this shocking parody on education is at bottom a moral one. Wanting moral and religious motives and guidance in education, we fall back on material ones. We supply the pupil with coarse pecuniary stimulants; we will not trust the teacher unless we can calculate his results in figures, and prove his competence by the addition of marks. We trust neither pupil nor teacher, and we give both low aims and ideals, and not high ideals and aims. And the same distrust of our moral control over education tends, in England at least, to foster the monstrous exaggeration of muscular exercise, which is now become a serious part of the educational scheme at schools and colleges. Boys and youths are prone enough to overrate their amusements without any stimulus, and need no teaching to put their studies as a bad second to their games. And now the modern schoolmaster and tutor snatches at gymnastics as the sheet-anchor of morality. He enforces games to the grave injury of boys' health, preaches from his pulpit the apotheosis of racing and football, in the feeble hope that by exhausting the body, he will make discipline easier, and check moral abuse.

The entire "public school," or barrack system, the college or cenobite system, as practised in England, with all their unnatural consequences and their essentially material spirit, may be, as things are, necessary evils, but they are thoroughly abnormal and vicious in principle. The normal and noble education can only be given in *families*, and not in barracks or convents. The moral, religious, and social stimulus of education ought to rise mainly there, and its groundwork should come from the parents. That the parents, as it is, are unfit, unworthy, unwilling to do it, absorbed as they are in the struggle for existence and the race for gain, is the shame and grief of our materialist habits, for it does not release the parents from their duty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They cannot hire experts to do their work, and test the experts' skill by the number of prizes that their pupils can bag, and the thousands of marks with which they can be credited.

It is too true now that few families can really give a high education, and few young persons can educate themselves even with assistance and opportunity. But there is no other way. The groundwork of education must be laid *at home*, and the essentials of education must come from the learner himself. The guidance, the inspiration, the higher organization of education, belongs no doubt to superior and special teachers. But only the rare superior spirit is worth much. The rank and file of hack teachers do more harm than good, except, it may be, in the mechanical rudiments of learning, which are hardly needed after the age of fifteen. From about that time of life it is guidance and inspiration that is needed, not hammering, cramming, and punishing. As years increase, what is wanted in education is far more freedom, individuality, diversity of bent, more leisure than we see now in the programme of any "educationist," nay, I will not hesitate to say it, more indulgence of any high taste, mere day-dreaming, if you will, in a word, more rest and peace. Education may help a man to form his mind: it cannot make it for him, though it may twist it or crush it. And that education will be best which honestly acknowledges how little it can do outside the home, how small is its power for good compared with the natural and acquired forces of each man's brain and soul.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## REFORMATORY OR PUNITIVE PRISON MANAGEMENT?

THE amazing article in the October FORUM, in favor of physical punishment for criminals, opens with this question: "What would be the result if human laws should undertake to decree that whoever offended against the well-being of the race should be rewarded, not punished?" I would answer this by asking another equally absurd: What would be the effect if human laws should decree that mad dogs should be whipped every time they bit a person, and then turned loose to bite again? These two absurd propositions merely serve to sharply characterize the two systems for treating criminals,—punitive and reformatory. One, as old as mediæval history, is represented by the rack, the pillory, and the whip: the other, the result of modern civilization, is represented by the reformatory, houses of correction, prisons, and penitentiaries,—the present American system. Is it a failure, as claimed by Mr. Andrews, the champion of retributive justice? If it *is* the cause of "fifty-fold" increase in criminals in fifty years, then it *is* a failure, and we should again adopt the punitive methods of punishment. The State should erect the whipping-post, and provide proper instruments for bodily torture proportionate to the offence; another committee should be added to every legislative body, known as the "Committee on Instruments and Measure of Punishment." The present advancement in applied mechanics would doubtless enable the procurement of instruments that would produce refined torture becoming to our Christian civilization.

Is crime on the increase out of proportion to the increase in population? This question cannot be satisfactorily answered by the student of pœnology by comparing undigested statistics of one locality at intervals of fifty years. This has led and will lead to great confusion and palpable misinformation, as we shall presently show. The function of statistics is the observation and analysis of facts. The larger the area, the greater the number of facts: the more minute the facts, the greater the possibility of critical analyses. Massachusetts will afford a good illustration of what I mean.

It is claimed that fifty years ago there was one criminal to every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eight hundred inhabitants; now one to every four hundred inhabitants. The natural inference from these figures is, that crime is greatly on the increase, and that, if the ratio is kept up, all the people of that old Puritan State will soon be behind prison-bars. It is a fact that its criminals have increased out of all proportion to the increase in population. But before we take alarm, and declare the whole prison treatment a failure and the cause of this, it would be well to inquire what is the nature of the crimes. Are they crimes against person and property, or against police regulations that were either not offences fifty years ago, or less punished then than now? In 1840 the vice of intemperance was not punished in Massachusetts as a crime, except in a few instances of gross bestiality. In 1885, Massachusetts had over eighteen thousand arrests for intemperance alone. Add to these the arrests of saloon-keepers for selling liquor without license and in violation of their licenses, and we have two important factors in this question. On the other hand, we are informed by Dr. Harris of Boston, now the commissioner of education of the United States, that in 1860 the cases of crimes against person and property in Massachusetts were more numerous proportionately than in 1885; and that in twenty-five years the crimes against person and property had decreased forty-four per cent, allowing for increase in population. Surely the good people of Massachusetts have no reason for alarm because their persons and property are safer than they were twenty-five years ago, while the drunkard and the liquor-seller are not so safe.

In a table prepared by Mr. Carroll D. Wright, United States commissioner of labor, showing sentences in the State of Massachusetts for all classes of offences, including drunkenness and liquor offences, from 1860 to 1879,—made from the official statistics as reported by the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor in its eleventh annual report, and the result of certified reports of the clerks of all the criminal courts in the State,—are found some very interesting facts. An examination of this table shows that the total number of sentences for all offences for the twenty years is 578,348. Of these, 340,814 were for drunkenness, including common drunkards; that is, sixty per cent of the total number of crimes in twenty years belong to "intoxicating liquor" offences, and the percentage of increase in this class of crime from 1860 to 1879 was 155.9. This same table shows, that for the same period there was an actual decrease of 20.1 in what are known as high crimes, that is, those that have always been recognized as crimes. Another important factor to consider in comparing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crime of fifty years ago with crime of the present, is in the great growth of our cities. Horace D. Wadlin, chief of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, states, "The population in the territory now comprised within city limits in Massachusetts has risen from 623,449, at the close of the war (1865), to 1,372,300, a gain of 122.11; while the State outside this territory has gained but 34.66 per cent." It is a matter of common notoriety that crime is greater in urban than in country districts; and this remarkable increase in the growth of our cities, out of all proportion to the increase of the country, will account for the large increase in petty offences and drunkenness. These very figures have been referred to and used to demonstrate crime on the increase in Massachusetts. Some one has said, "There is nothing more misleading than figures, except facts."

Happily in this discussion we are not limited to the meagre statistics of one locality or one State, but have before us a late census bulletin on convicts in penitentiaries in all the States of the Union, prepared by Dr. F. H. Wines, government agent and inspector for statistics of pauperism and crime. The figures, when compared with a report made by the same special agent ten years ago, show an actual increase of 9,695 in the number of penitentiary convicts. The population of the country, according to the tenth census, was 50,155,783; the number of convicts in penitentiaries, including leased prisoners at that date, was 35,538; the ratio of convicts to the population was 709 in each million. The eleventh census shows the population to be 62,622,250, and the number of convicts 45,233; the ratio of convicts to the population being 723—an increase of only 13 to the million. Dr. Wines, who is regarded as the best authority in this country on criminal statistics, says that "this growth is not alarming, since further study may result in an explanation of it, or even in showing that crime of a serious nature is rather on the decline in this country than on the increase."

The result of an examination of statistics relating to juvenile reformatories, as compared with ten years ago, is still more encouraging. The total number in the United States in 1890 was 14,846; the number reported in 1880 was 11,468—an increase of 3,378. In 1880 the ratio was 229 in each million of population; in 1890 it was 237—an increase of only 8 to the million. It is an interesting fact to notice that the foreign population furnishes more than one-half of these juvenile delinquents, as shown by the census report.

We now turn to the number of convicts in prisons and peniten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tiaries in various States for violation of the criminal code of the United States, and we have a still better showing that crime of a serious character is on the decline. These statistics are carefully collected annually by direction of the attorney-general, and under the supervision of the general agent. I give them for the last five years. In 1886 there were confined in the various institutions in this country 1,027 United States prisoners; in 1887, 842; in 1888, 1,125; in 1889, 1,083; in 1890, 1,011. This shows an actual decrease notwithstanding the increase in population.

In estimating the increase in crime, one important factor should be considered that cannot be supported by statistics. It is suspected and believed that in recent years the countries of Europe are using every available means to unload their pauper and criminal population upon our shores: so manifest did this appear, that the General Government has recently taken vigorous measures to prevent these "lawless gangs" from landing. Unquestionably this is a great cause for increase in our criminal population.

It will be noticed that, in answering the question, "Is crime on the increase?" I have thus far confined the investigation chiefly to those ordinarily known as felons,—convicts that are sentenced to prison, usually for a term of years. It is in the treatment of these, that the reformatory methods can be tested. From the above showing, where is the ground for the bold statement that "the reformatory system of treating prisoners is a failure"? Rhetorical epithets of "bouquet system," "roast beef," "orchestral," from "punishment to bouquets," may distinguish the author for ornamentation in diction, but not in comprehensive knowledge of what is meant by the "reform system." With a very few exceptions, the entire civilized world has discarded an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" code of punishment. They have learned that moral coercion, used to infuse skill into the hand, education in the head, and right rules of living in the heart, has more discipline in it, and is a greater force in protecting society from crime, than all the pain that brute force could inflict, or physical nature endure.

The limits of this article will not permit any general discussion of all the means and advantages that are being used by the wardens in our prisons to train men for good citizenship by habits of work, and rules of right living. It has been my official duty, as well as my privilege, to visit many of these institutions, and personally to witness the discipline, and the kindly teaching of the convict helpful lessons

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the future rule of his life; in many cases adapting the work, the education, and discipline to the individual.

The wardens of our prisons are not a class of theorists or impracticable sentimentalists. They are, as a rule, men of sound judgment and broad humanity. An examination of a few aphorisms found in the splendid literature written by these men evidences the scope to which they would carry the reform methods: "Public security requires the reformation or incapacitation of the wrong-doer;" "Isolation until reformation;" "Prison reform is best aided by crime preventative;" "While punishing for the crime, strive to save the man;" "The primary object of all reformatory methods is protection to society;" "Non-partisanship in prison management." Here is the wisdom of the statesman, the philosophy of the scientist, and the ethics of the Christian.

We now turn to the dark side of the crime problem, represented by the jail and the workhouse, where offenders are sentenced for a short time for misdemeanors. The increase of criminals in these institutions is out of all proportion to the increase in population. We are unable to obtain all the late census statistics relating to these, but the jails will show an increase of 53.95 per cent in ten years: doubtless the workhouse will keep pace with this ratio. The question is asked: "Do our new methods reform these?" I answer, "No;" and for the most obvious reason. The shortness of the term of sentence, and environments of the place of commitment, preclude the possibility of any reformatory work. Any system of reform that could in one short month cure the ills of these debased, degraded, and corrupt offsprings of the criminal sewages of our large cities, would be a great blessing to the race. Thirty days of hypodermic injection of labor at the workhouse, or one month of elixir of ease, apathy, and indifference at the common jail, would be as fruitless as one injection of "lymph" to cure consumption, or one application of "sovereign balm" to cure rheumatism.

An analysis of statistics of this home guard of the army of criminals shows that more than one-half of them are what are known as "repeaters," professionals in petty crimes for "revenue," or for "bed and board" in some comfortable jail or workhouse. Then there are the habitual drunkards that crowd these jails and workhouses in all our large cities. The number of these is simply enormous, and daily increasing. The arrests for drunkenness in New York City for the year 1890 were 31,534; in Philadelphia, for the same year, 24,661; in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boston, for the year 1889, 24,000; in Chicago, for the same year, 31,164. It is estimated that 365,000 men are arrested annually in this country for drunkenness alone—an army greater than the arrests for all other offences. One who has ever visited our police courts, and witnessed the grinding-out process, is familiar with the usual sentence,—"Thirty days in jail," or at the "workhouse." It is startling to think that this is chanted a thousand times every day in the year, and is the principal part of the litany of these temples of justice.

We have thus briefly classified and analyzed the army of criminals, that we may the better observe the advancement made by reform methods, and locate the strong intrenchments of the foe. There is certainly no special cause for alarm at the comparative showing of the inmates of our prisons, penitentiaries, houses of correction, and juvenile reformatories. When we compare in any way the statistics of present crime with the apparent crime of fifty years ago, we must consider that our rapid growth and advancing civilization have caused hundreds of laws to be enacted, making offences of those matters which were not then regarded as crimes. There are hundreds of prisoners serving sentences for violation of internal revenue laws, national bank laws, and post-office laws, most of which offences were unprovided for by legislation fifty years ago. Violations of municipal regulations now frequent were not recognized, or provided for as offences, even twenty years ago. Could we compare the arrests made in 1890 with those in 1840 for similar offences, it would undoubtedly show a decrease rather than an increase in crime, notwithstanding the fact that never in our nation's history were we so well equipped for making prompt arrests and convictions as at present.

The increase of crime, as we have shown, is not in the serious class of offences against person and property, known as "felonies," but in petty offences or misdemeanors, which include the vast horde of drunkards that appear daily in our police courts, where is heard the monotonous sentence, "Thirty days." This is the strategic point for the application of the "reform system." This, however, cannot be applied without a change in all our criminal codes and many of the police regulations. In making these changes, the State should abandon all idea of short sentences as punishment. Imprisonment for the first offence should be isolated, so that the bad may not get worse, and those that are not inherently criminal may not be contaminated by the criminal element. On the second offence let these offenders be taken under the custody of the State or City as an element too

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dangerous to be at large. Let their place of imprisonment be similar in discipline and work to the reformatories and prisons. Let the sentence be indeterminate, and these offenders be given to understand that they cannot again have their liberty until they have developed such qualifications as a board of pardons would regard as an evidence of fitness for restoration to freedom and citizenship. Can this be done? Yes: in law, as in morals, "that can be done which ought to be done."

But what about the ever-increasing army of drunkards? Some plan must be adopted for the relief of society from the expense and evil entailed by the existence of so many thousand habitual drunkards. Considering these from a reformatory standpoint, or in their civic relations, the problem is most perplexing to both the Christian and the Statesman. So far the lighthouse of the Church and the lifeboat of the State have proved ineffectual remedies. To the one they will not look for help, and the other has only proved a temporary rescue.

That intemperance is a disease, and not a crime, may be an interesting study to the student of pathology; but whether a disease, or a crime, or both, its victims are equally dangerous to society. The repeated arrest and short confinement of the habitual drunkard, only adds length of days to his life of debauchery, by affording conditions for bodily recuperation, but not for mental or moral regeneration. "They return to their wallowing in the mire." You drive them from one locality in a city, and they will transfer their brutality and vice to some other. They have so long breathed the malaria of the feculent slums, that it is their very life. Like some poisonous plants, they flourish only on decay. These furnish the great army of lazzaroni that fill our poorhouses, and tax our charities. The State should abandon its mild and ineffectual methods of treating this class of offenders, and regard them as a dangerous element of society, that must be taken into custody, and vigorously treated and disciplined until they are cured of the disease of drunkenness, or their vicious criminal appetites are regenerated. It is not the function or duty of the State to save men from sin or vice; but, because vice has taken on the form of a public nuisance, the State must protect society. In the punishment of these offenders two objects should be considered,—present protection and future security. To accomplish both these ends necessitates a place of confinement with medical, physical, and moral treatment until probable cure. Let steady labor, firm discipline, and proper medicine be the punishment by which a cure is effected.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If one-half the expense that is now annually incurred in protecting society from this class and their criminal offspring, was appropriated for the building of inebriate asylums, we would soon have the habitual drunkard in safe custody, and under proper treatment. Let the first imprisonment to these institutions be for a short duration, the object being to create an abiding impression of hard work and rigid discipline. This impression would cause a wholesome dread of incarceration, and doubtless deter many offenders. For the second offence, let the sentence be for an indeterminate period, and the offender be given to understand that his weak character and uncontrollable appetite require continuous supervision and treatment, and that he will be held by the majesty of the law until a board of pardons shall determine his fitness for freedom and society. This plan suggests many apparent risks of authority abused, and personal rights infringed; but these could be so guarded by the law and the courts as to prevent any substantial injury. This plan would only be carrying out, and adapting to the habitual drunkard, some of the last best thought of reform methods, as illustrated by the New York State Reformatory at Elmira, N.Y., the Massachusetts Reformatory at Concord, Mass., the Reformatory at Huntington, Penn., and other similar institutions. Until this or some similar method is adopted for this numerous class of offenders, the "reform system" cannot be made chargeable for their increase; for it cannot reform them until it has the place and opportunity to apply its methods: and until then let no man talk of going back to the whip and pillory. Reforms do not go that way.

The history of crime is as old as the human race. Its punishment was based upon the first offence, when "the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him." This instinct for revenge, that would have killed Cain, impelled the earlier governments to put a sudden and violent end to every one that violated its laws, however trifling: the stealing of coin, the sullenness of slaves, no less than wilful murder, demanded the extreme penalty of death. As civilization advanced, this deep-seated feeling for revenge gradually wore away, and the hatred for criminals was pacified by their public exposure to cruel bodily torture, even to the stretching of muscles and the breaking of bones. In the march of civilization, this mode of punishment was changed to solitary confinement in sombre towers and dismal prisons. It was in these that John Howard found them one hundred years ago, when he commenced his investigation of prisons, and told the world of that awful hell in which the doomed



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men live out their short lives in hunger, filth, and torture. This was the commencement of what is known as the "reformatory system of treating prisoners." The history of the growth of this reform, still in its experimental stages, is a history of successes and failures. Time is an essential element in working out any great reform; for such is the constitution of the mind and the composition of society, that rapid growth cannot be attained. The seed of prison reform planted by John Howard over a century ago, has spread over the civilized world, and its fruit is a test of its wisdom. Its advocates are neither afraid nor ashamed to submit their aims, methods, and measures to the fullest scrutiny: they challenge investigation. In every human being there is a spark of mankind that no criminal act can entirely extinguish, a remnant of character that furnishes a starting-point from which to build a new life. The experience of a century has shown that the propagators of this system were not mistaken in seizing this underlying truth as the foundation upon which to build the reform. The fecund parable of "the leaven that was hid in the three measures of meal until the whole was leavened," is the symbol of their faith and works. Restored energies, and regenerated faculties mobilized to combat the force of habit and power of vice, are their ambitious achievements. The State, from a sense of protection, sees this truth, and begins to shape its laws in harmony. This reform has pitched its tent in every contested field: it is now building permanent homes on conquered territory. The researches of science, the pleadings of philanthropy, the commands of religion, and the mandates of the law, combine to establish its wisdom

ELIJAH C. FOSTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## UNREGULATED COMPETITION SELF-DESTRUCTIVE.

A MAXIM often heard, but, like other maxims, commonly used without reflection, asserts that "competition is the life of trade." An inquiry addressed to a recognized expert in such matters, Mr. A. R. Spofford, the accomplished and almost omniscient Librarian of Congress, disclosed the fact that he was totally unable to trace its origin, and that in his opinion, like Topsy, it was never born, but simply "growed." "I much regret," he said, "not to have it in my power to assign any authorship to the phrase 'Competition is the life of trade.' All the reference books fail to contain it. Very probably it is one of the thousands of proverbs which pass current without a father." W. W. Story, in his "Conversations in a Studio," well says that "phrases and formulas rule the world more than ideas. They are easy to say; they have a gloss of truth; and they save the trouble of thinking." He describes some of them as "a sort of Liebig's Extract, put up in a portable can, and capable of dilution into infinite twaddle."

This comment is quite appropriate to the maxim just quoted. In some simple period of Anglo-Saxon history—perhaps after observing the stimulating effect produced upon a village mercer by an opposition establishment presenting a larger choice from newer goods, or perchance in view of a better wagon or a faster horse purchased by a cross-country carrier to enable him to equal the service tendered by a progressive rival—the thought was conceived that "competition is the life of trade." The phrase was easy and the idea attractive: its truth under certain circumstances was undeniable. The saying passed into common circulation, and finally became dignified with the appellation of a Maxim with a capital M, in which capacity it has long done service. It has been quoted in the ephemeral utterances of the press and in the solemn deliverances of the courts, and has been treated on all hands as expressing an incontestable verity. Its use has often been pushed so far as to imply the condemnation of any opposite idea; and judges have once and again assured us that, whereas it is an established maxim that "competition is the life of trade," the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inference is irresistible that any contract or agreement which imposes the slightest restraint upon competition is against public policy, and therefore illegal and void.

Yet if those who use the phrase so glibly, and who dilute its application so infinitely, would but pause for a moment, and reflect, they would see that it was as easy in the first instance to have said that "competition is the death of trade;" and, if that turn had been given to the thought, all its consequences and inferences would have been reversed. The village mercer who bought heavily and sold with little profit, in his anxiety to hold his own against the encroachments of his enterprising rival, very likely found himself before long a bankrupt. The poor carter, amply able alone to handle all the traffic of his route, after the purchase of his new horse and cart was to be seen carrying only half-loads, and receiving lower rates upon what business he was able to retain. A compromise was perhaps arrived at before either party was absolutely ruined, by which one bought out the other at a sacrifice; or, more probably, the two formed a partnership (or trust), by which their competition was effaced.

These simple examples show the danger which lurks in generalizations. "Competition is the life of trade;" "Competition is the death of trade:" one phrase is as true as the other. For all that appears, it was a toss-up which of the two should become current as the expression of a general thought. The public may often say that "competition is the life of trade," while at the same moment the competing traders or manufacturers themselves, behind their doors, are groaning that "competition is sure to be their death;" and the latter view, in turn, may be accepted by the public as correct when one of the competitors has been forced from the field and the other pushes for the advantages of his victory.

Competition is war. It may be war to the knife, fierce and deadly: it may be a gentlemanly contest with foils and masks, or padded gloves. At times it is waged at every point relentlessly; again it is confined to a single phase of contact: but, however conducted, in its essence it is war; and when carried to its extreme conclusion it means financial ruin to one or the other of the contestants. No actual war has yet been waged with repeating-rifles, magazine-guns, smokeless powder, and dynamite; but modern arsenals are filled with them. In the industrial strife which characterizes the exit of the century, a universal competitive warfare exists, in which the use of similar destructive agencies is clearly obvious. A new and exaggerated impulse has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been given to the violence of competition. Men rush to and fro in the market-places, and the world is distracted by their contests. Every active vocation exhibits a continual conflict, and the fallen are found on every side. Is this persistent warfare a blessing, or a curse? Is competition as it now presents itself a force to be encouraged and developed, or to be put in harness and controlled?

The history of the English common law shows that fundamental changes in its principles and rules have been introduced from time to time to meet the requirements of advancing civilization. Progress in this direction has been cautious and slow. The English as a race are highly conservative, deeply grounded in what they term the "good old principles" that governed the nation in the "good old days" of the indefinite and sluggish past. But from time to time they have been confronted by a revolution; revolutions not always taking the form of physical warfare, but more often accomplished through legislative processes by the uprising of majorities. Illustrations of this abound, some of which are cognate to our subject. For many centuries, "engrossing," "regrating," and "forestalling" were very serious matters. Following the analogy of the Roman civil law, by which persons who monopolized grain and other products of the earth were denounced as *dardanarii*, and severely punished, a statute was enacted by Parliament in the reign of Edward VI., in the year 1552, which defined the three offences named above, and provided penalties appropriate to their enormity. This was the law of England until 7–8 Victoria (1845), when the statute of Edward VI. was repealed. The time had arrived when it became obvious that the ancient theories would no longer answer. Through the necessities of enlarging trade and commerce, business methods had arisen which the ancient law held criminal: one or the other must give way, and the law was accordingly reversed to meet the demands of the commercial public. Yet the thought on which the statute of Edward VI. was grounded had so long controlled the English-speaking race, that even at the present day the practices referred to are offensive to many, and the absence of punitive legislation is frequently deplored.

"Engrossing" was the offence of buying up large quantities of corn with the intent to sell again. It was said, that, if this dangerous practice was permitted, one or more men could raise the price of provisions at will. The general engrossing of any other commodity, as well as grain, with intent thereafter to sell it at an unreasonable price, also came within the condemnation of the statute. The evil apprehended

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the modern "corner," which the law endeavored by futile penalties to prevent.

"Forestalling" consisted in buying or contracting for merchandise or victual on its way to market, or dissuading persons from bringing their goods or provisions there; any of which practices, it was said, makes the market dear to the fair dealer.

"Regrating" was the crime of buying corn (meaning grain) or any other "dead victual," and selling it again in the same market or within four miles of it, so as to raise the price. It was considered an offence against public trade, because the price of provisions advanced with each change of ownership. It is evident that our modern boards of trade and produce exchanges would have little use for their diversified machinery under such a law as that. Lord Coke gave a scope even broader than this to the crime of regrating, which he defined as including every practice or device—by act, conspiracy, word, or news—to enhance the price of victuals or other merchandise. The monthly crop bulletins of our Department of Agriculture would often have been indictable in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The farmers of that day may well have wondered where their rights came in, finding themselves liable to punishment for advancing prices when the crop was short.

The abandonment of these and other restrictive laws, and the substitution in their place of absolute freedom in business methods,—leaving producers and dealers at liberty to fix their prices as they could, subject to the control of what was called the "great law of supply and demand," or, in other words, subject to the regulation imposed by unrestricted competition,—was a revolution indeed. As the power of competition became perceptible to economists and statesmen, it was adopted as the panacea for all industrial evils. It was clearly adequate to the control of wages; for the supply of labor has generally exceeded the demand, and has constantly increased, especially in view of the rapid introduction of labor-saving machinery in every direction. It was competent to prevent over-reaching in the price of manufactured articles; for the production of goods at a heavy profit immediately led to the establishment of rival manufactories by the score. It was even able to control the price of food; for the world was wide, and modern transportation facilities enabled the surplus products of one country to meet the destitution of another, keeping prices everywhere substantially upon an even keel. Competition was welcomed as the world's deliverer. That it was sure to keep prices

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down was the sufficient argument; that it was equally sure, in the end, to breed industrial calamity by forcing prices down too far, was not perceived: the few who pointed out the danger were ridiculed.

The nineteenth century has been dominated by this idea: every thing having a tendency to restrict the force of competition has been frowned upon and condemned. The maintenance of absolute freedom in competition has been a public war-cry, and often a rule of jurisprudence. Laws have again and again been devised to prevent the least amelioration of competitive conditions. Every effort has been made to give to competitive forces the fullest scope; and the public—meaning always that part of the public not engaged in the particular conflict in question—has come to believe that it has a right in its own general interest to require the prompt suppression of all attempts at interference with competition, claiming it to be the life of trade, and an absolute necessity to the welfare of the State. The question of the right or the wrong of a general belief is always a fair one, and the particular belief referred to may properly now be challenged in the light of experience. How has it worked, and how is it working?

It seems probable, that if Adam Smith were to come to life again to-day he would be quite surprised at some of the results of theories which he took a prominent part in formulating. His attention as a keen observer would be at once attracted by many things which have so quietly grown up among us that their tendency has not been generally perceived.

For example, we have become accustomed to the fact that labor organizes everywhere. The price of labor is no longer a market-price, established by competition, in which every applicant for work is let alone, and is free to make his own bargain with his employer: on the contrary, it is controlled by a vast network of trade unions. Carpenters, masons, compositors, weavers, switchmen, firemen, engineers, tailors, boot-makers, hatters, even miners, and stevedores—all manual workmen who may by any stretch of courtesy regard themselves as skilled laborers—have combined among themselves, against their employers and against the world, with the avowed object of increasing their wages, controlling accretions to their number, shortening their hours of work, and in every way minimizing the effects of competition. Daring spirits among them have conceived the idea not only of extending this organization through every class of workmen, skilled or unskilled, but also of combining the whole into a universal federation, which, as "Knights of Labor," shall control the production of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world; and every year discloses progress in this direction through the association of new labor groups and the rendering of mutual aid and support between existing sections.

Manufacturers also, of every kind, are constantly found agreeing among themselves to control the constant tendency to depress prices below a just remuneration for invested capital and skill. The number of known associations of this character can be reckoned by hundreds, embracing the producers of almost every kind of article used or consumed by the public at large, from cradles to coffins. The modern "trust" is only one form of this development, originally named from the organization of a board of trustees who held the titles to the property of the constituent members in an actual trust relation for the benefit of all; but the name is now frequently applied to all forms of associated production in which several manufacturers combine to regulate their competition with each other. The invention of the "trust" proper, as applied to the manufacture and sale of oil, copper, lead, sugar, etc., aroused great opposition by reason of the opportunity afforded for concerted operations upon a gigantic scale; but notwithstanding the severe denunciation expressed against manufacturers' syndicates, and the continued attempts to put them down by legislative prohibitions, upon the theory that they are conspiracies against the public good, their formation quietly proceeds day by day, and their strength is constantly increased as new opportunities are seen for advanced efficiency.

This movement, moreover, is by no means confined to the two fields of labor and capital. Lawyers frequently agree upon a minimum schedule of charges. Medical schools teach the avoidance of competition among practitioners through rules prohibiting the solicitation of patronage and the depreciation of fees, inculcated under the alluring title of "medical ethics." Livery-stable proprietors in every village tacitly or openly agree upon their rates. Coal exchanges everywhere make prices for fuel by the season. Insurance companies establish by concerted action the premiums to be demanded, and enforce their agreements with severity. Millers and miners unite in fixing prices upon their products. Railways agree upon their tariffs and classifications. Ranchmen establish a so-called "trust" to regulate the sale of live-stock. Rival packing-houses concur in maintaining profitable returns upon the sale of their product. Farmers unite to protect themselves against the middlemen who distribute their crops through the markets of the world: by holding back their surplus

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from immediate consumption, and in other ways, they are able to some extent to remedy a pressure which they feel to be unjust, but which is simply the result of unrestricted competition in the open commerce of the day. While the agricultural interests have perhaps been slower than others to introduce the policy of combination for mutual support, the signs of the times are clear in indicating that the farmers now perceive their opportunity, and propose to push it to the utmost limit.

Incidentally it must be conceded that there are evils as well as advantages apparent on the face of this universal movement in restraint of competition. What is one man's gain is another's loss. Examples of unreasonable exaction arising from cupidity and greed, have not been wanting. While every one is ready to admit, as an abstract proposition, that it is right that others should receive a fair recompense for what they produce or sell, nevertheless the determination of the question of what is a fair and what an extortionate remuneration depends altogether upon the observer's point of view. Thus these alliances of labor, trade, and capital, have at times furnished opportunity for unreasonable demands; and well-founded complaints have arisen of unjust advantage taken when competition has for a season been circumscribed.

Yet there is much truth in the counter-claim that such instances in the end correct themselves, and that no combination has yet been made, or perhaps ever can be made, of sufficient breadth and strength to maintain itself in exorbitant exactions. And unquestionably such combinations afford opportunity for the introduction of great economies in the processes of manufacture and distribution, by means of which prices charged to the ultimate consumer have again and again been very materially reduced. The saving of waste is a factor of great importance to be considered in weighing the advantages and disadvantages of co-operative production, and one in respect to which the statistics are often extremely startling.

Such considerations, however, are superficial only. The fundamental fact which lies at the root of the matter is this: that unrestricted competition as an economic principle is too destructive to be permitted to exist; it has been pushed away from every industrial calling. As in actual war the writ of *habeas corpus* is suspended, and martial law replaces the processes of civil courts, so in the stress of unregulated competition, which is in fact a universal commercial warfare, necessities have arisen which know no law, and under which every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effort to maintain the existence of unrestricted competition has broken down. Legislators who make laws from the standpoint of the politician are appalled by the number of votes found in organizations of working-men, meeting behind closed doors, for the suppression of competition. Manufacturers in self-defence either seek out cunning devices to evade the law, or secretly organize to defy it. In a word, the theory which attempted to forbid all efforts to control the force of competition has found itself unable to withstand the pressure of commercial necessities: it has been over-ridden by actualities that cannot be ignored. The force which was welcomed as a protective and regulative social agency has developed a power for evil requiring rigid measures for its control. Competition is like steam and electricity, the two great mechanic agencies of these latter days, which are useful almost beyond conception when subjugated and restrained, but which scatter destruction and death when uncontrolled.

This result, now clearly defined, has not been unforeseen by intelligent observers. The truth that unrestrained competition is essentially self-destructive has been clearly pointed out by men whose thought is worthy. Unfortunately most men do not think worthily, or do not think at all: they are ruled by phrases, and they catch the crude ideas of others as they fly.

Compare the very recent utterances of the highest tribunals of two States in respect to railway pools,—a form of protection against the ruin involved in unregulated competition, which has been prohibited by law so far as interstate commerce is concerned, and in many of the States as well.

The Supreme Court of Louisiana writes as follows:—

"It is too clear for further argument or illustration that the first, the lasting, and inevitable result of the agreement to the public was to stifle competition; and, as competition is the life of trade, the effect of the contract must necessarily and inevitably have been injurious to public interest, and hence it was contrary to public policy. . . . American jurisprudence has firmly settled the doctrine that all contracts which have a palpable tendency to stifle competition, either in the market-value of commodities or in the carriage and transportation of such commodities, are contrary to public policy, and are therefore incapable of conferring upon the parties thereto any rights which a court of justice can recognize or enforce."

On the other hand, the Supreme Court of New Hampshire says:—

"When pooling contracts prevent an unhealthy competition, and furnish the public with adequate facilities at fixed and reasonable rates, they are beneficial, and in accord with sound principles of public policy. . . . The public interest is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not subserved by competition which reduces the rate of transportation below the standpoint of fair compensation. . . . Arrangements and contracts between competing railroads, by which unrestrained competition is prevented, do not contravene public policy."

So in respect to other industrial combinations. While the general rule of decision in American tribunals has unquestionably been in line with a case in Ohio, in respect to an association of salt manufacturers,—which held that the inevitable tendency of such contracts is injurious to the public, and that on grounds of public policy the agreement in question could not be enforced,—nevertheless a recent case in Massachusetts decides that—

"A combination between manufacturers, intended not to restrict production, but simply to maintain a fair and uniform price, and to prevent the injurious effects to producers and customers of fluctuating prices caused by undue competition, is not in restraint of trade or against public policy."

These protests against the prevailing current of decision in the United States find support from England, where judges have widely disagreed, but where the inevitable disaster consequent upon unregulated competition was perceived earlier than in this country.

Light may perhaps be thrown upon the subject by looking for a moment at the history of monopolies under the common law. Originally the farming-out of exclusive privileges was considered a perquisite of the king and a legitimate source of his revenue. The sovereign was accustomed to issue letters-patent on all occasions where money was to be made therefrom, conceding to particular persons absolute monopolies of various kinds, especially of the right to carry on particular descriptions of traffic. In this view a monopoly was defined as "an exclusive right granted to a few of something which was before a common right."

These grants became so frequent during the time of Queen Elizabeth, and gave rise to so many complaints, that she was finally obliged to withdraw many of the most obnoxious, after a long contest, in which a monopoly of the right to make and sell playing-cards had been held by the court to be against the common law. In the reign of James I., an act was passed preventing their creation in future, except for limited periods, in the case of copyrights, and patents for new inventions.

An exclusive grant of a privilege new and original, not restraining any person or corporation in any liberty or trade before enjoyed by them, was not, strictly speaking, a monopoly. Grants of this descrip-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion have been numerous; for example, the right to construct and operate a tramway in a city street. No one had a right to do this until the franchise was first conferred: and from the very nature of the case the grant was generally exclusive; for the use of the same street by two competing lines of railway could not often be tolerated. So of the right conferred upon a water company to supply water through pipes laid under the streets of a city, or for the distribution of gas, steam, or electricity. The attempt which has been made at times to regulate the prices of these necessary articles through competition has uniformly proved a disastrous if not a ridiculous failure. Gas companies, for example, became extremely and unexpectedly profitable. The public demanded competition; permits were granted to rival companies, and pipes and mains were duplicated; prices were rapidly reduced; the point of profitable production was soon passed; one company or the other was forced to surrender; a sale or consolidation was effected; a re-organization took place, in which the cost of the unnecessary plant was fully represented; and the public thereafter had to pay rates required to satisfy the holders of the enlarged capitalization for their aggregate investment, besides having been subjected to the annoyance of needless injury to the streets. Mr. Charles Whiting Baker, in his interesting work entitled "Monopolies and the People," tells us that this farce has been repeated in at least twenty cities in the United States, and in every case with the same result. In matters of this kind the true policy unquestionably is to protect rigidly the exclusive nature of the grant, and, as a condition precedent thereof, to impose a right to control the price of the service rendered within a reasonable limit, which, in default of other agreement, should be a judicial rather than an administrative question.

There are many other enterprises of even larger scope,—such as bridges, canals, telegraphs, and railways,—which are commonly termed "monopolies;" and the public would probably be better served by maintaining their substantially exclusive character, conditioned upon their being subject to proper and reasonable supervision in the matter of tolls and facilities. A new railway cannot be constructed in England as a competitive agency merely: it must be shown to answer a general public need. The pursuit of a contrary policy in this country has led to disastrous consequences.

The opportunity to impose proper restrictions has been overlooked, unfortunately, in many cases, in the hasty granting of charters and concessions; and, in lieu of attempting to re-establish the rights of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public by negotiation or by legislation within proper limits, an effort has been made to obtain regulation indirectly through the application of universal competition. As in every other industrial domain, this effort has failed and will fail. It is a very serious question, and one by no means to be cavalierly dismissed, whether a wiser policy than the present may not be found in extending the system which has worked and is working well in many instances; whether monopoly under suitable supervision and control might not often be substituted with profit for the industrial fetich of the nineteenth century known as "free and unrestricted competition."

However this may be, the fact is clear, that in spite of public misconception, and in defiance of ill-considered decisions, and statutes born of superficial thought, the regulation of competition is to-day considerable. This regulation is voluntary and self-assumed in each department of industry. It is truly republican in that it rests upon the consent of the governed. If "healthy competition" be a proper phrase, there must also be a competition which is unhealthy: this alternative has been ignored by the makers and the expounders of the law. As a necessary consequence, each industry has found itself compelled, in self-defence, to take up the subject within its own membership. Measures have been everywhere adopted to subdue and ameliorate the evil results of inordinate and excessive competitive strife. Has not the time come for a reversal of the legislative attitude? Would it not be well for Congress, State Legislatures, and the Judiciary to cease their futile attempts to maintain unqualified freedom of competition, and substitute therefor a recognition of the right of every industry to combine under proper supervision, and to make agreements for the maintenance of just and reasonable prices, the prevention of the enormous wastage consequent upon warlike conditions, and the preservation of existing institutions through the years to come?

Unless this course is adopted, a social convulsion may fairly be apprehended, forced by the universal and necessary repudiation of existing laws and rules of decision, and by the general formation of combinations without their pale. Even now lines are being drawn which array different parts of our land against each other upon considerations of purely sectional interest, growing out of the preponderance here or there of this or that special form of industry. Yet the very agitators who take the lead in movements of this character, while denouncing combinations which they conceive to be against their right,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insist upon the formation of organizations of the same essential character for their own protection in the social struggle. Every person who thinks he finds a hundred forms of oppression directed against his peace, sincerely believes his own similar organization to be a necessary and salutary expedient for self-defence.

The regulation of competition is a very different thing from its suppression. Attempts to restrain its force are commonly denounced as if designed to extinguish it altogether; but in many cases its existence can be best preserved by its efficient regulation. As a dominating social principle, competition is indispensable, and can never be effaced.

Another so-called aphorism, said to have fallen from the lips of Sir Robert Stephenson, has been perverted to the misguidance of many. Coming from the father of the English railway system, his remark—that "when combination is possible, competition is impossible"—has been treated as an admission against interest, and forced to applications the farthest possible from his thought. Every observer may now perceive, if he will but use his eyes, that the mere possibility of combination does not make competition impossible; more than this, that actual combination does not put an end to competition, unless it is so complete as to efface individuality of action. Combinations to that extent may be made; for example, a purchase removes one of the competitors from the field; a partnership combines titles and purses, and makes previously hostile interests identical; a corporation sometimes effects even broader unification. Strange to say, such coalitions as these have been regarded as legitimate. It is only in cases where the union stops short of the complete extinguishment of competition, that so-called "public policy" has interposed its prohibitions. In a speech delivered in Montreal, Sir Robert argued cogently against the encouragement of reckless competition in railway building, and pointed to amalgamation as the remedy. What he evidently meant by the remark first quoted was, that, when combination is possible, the continuance of disastrous competition may be avoided.

Combinations which are less than actual consolidations do not extinguish competition: they regulate it with more or less efficiency, and they often go so far as to suspend its operation in respect to one or more important features of the strife, for example, the price paid or the time consumed. But as long as the employer or the purchaser has a choice, so long there is competition; and the independent agencies which are preserved will stretch their remaining freedom to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

utmost limit. A reaction is presently perceived; the competitive strife increases until its renewed violence requires government once more. Thus the production and labor and traffic of the world are each subject to a constant fluctuation. The natural tendency towards free competition is opposed by the effort to ameliorate its violence. On the one hand, an occasional physical amalgamation occurs: on the other hand, bankruptcies sometimes take place.

Either of these results, however, is extremely exceptional. In the vast majority of cases to-day, competition is regulated, and its very existence is in fact preserved, by means of agreements or understandings between the competing parties. Compacts of this nature are often secret; they are usually considered as merely honorary, that is, as not enforceable at law: yet their existence is so universal and so necessary, that without them the wheels of trade would cease to turn. The actual working of the opposing forces in each industrial vocation may be likened to the pulsation of a mighty engine. The piston slides backward and forward in the cylinder, driven in one direction by the almost irresistible tendency to compete bitterly, and in the other by the instinct of self-preservation, which demands that the deadly strife be controlled. In rare instances a cylinder-head blows out, or an escape-valve breaks, involving a temporary stoppage of the machinery; but in the usual course of events this ceaseless alternation moves the commerce of the world.

When once the true condition of affairs is appreciated, the amelioration of many existing difficulties will be possible. A broader and more statesmanlike treatment of the subject would let both these hostile forces equally alone. It would cease the vain attempt to suppress contracts for the reasonable regulation of competition. It would give to agreements in restraint of its destructive tendencies the dignity of right. It would tear away the veil of secrecy which now surrounds such compacts, by removing the necessity for secrecy. It would terminate legislative discriminations against intelligence and capital. It would put upon the same footing trusts and labor unions, railway pools and farmers' alliances, manufacturers' syndicates, insurance boards, associations of ranchmen and of packing-house proprietors, in short, all forms of industrial agreements intended to prevent the ruin which attends unregulated competition. In *quasi* public matters, the State might exercise a supervisory control for the prevention of extortion, affording at the same time the reciprocal protection to investments which justice requires; but the right would be conceded to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the members of each department of our complex social system to enter into contract obligations of federation designed to temper the violence of the destructive forces which oppress them.

This right has been demonstrated as essential by the fact that such agreements are universally and usefully employed, in spite of persistent efforts to put them down. They are justified by their results, as well as by sound reason. The policy of undertaking, by legal barriers, to prevent the regulation of competition, has been fully tried, and found wanting.

ALDACE F. WALKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## THE WORK OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

A SOMEWHAT silent but active revolution is in progress among the women of the United States, by which the old conditions that consigned them to inferiority and subjection to men, are gradually being changed. American women are leading their sex throughout the world to a higher life by their work in every State of the Union. One of the principal means by which this revolution, or "reformation" as some call it, is to be finally effected, will be through the women's clubs that are becoming so numerous.

To whatever extent women's clubs may grow, there need be no fear that they will be used for any thing but good. The distinction that nature has made between the dispositions of women and men, together with the treatment to which women have been subjected throughout the ages, has acted upon their habits of thought in such manner that now, when women band themselves together to achieve some common end, their impulses lead them so strongly to be helpful that their united work takes on an entirely different character in many ways from the associated work of their brethren. In nothing is this divergence shown so plainly as in the clubs of the two sexes. While the clubs of men consist usually of luxuriously appointed apartments, with card-rooms, bars, restaurants, bowling-alleys, and billiard-rooms for the comfort and enjoyment of the members only, women's clubs always have a basis of philanthropy, even when instituted for merely social purposes. How far the clubs of women are different from those of men is evident from the earliest of their organizations, founded while the air was still resonant with the demands made by the advocates of both sexes for the fitness of women to help manage the government they were forced to obey, as well as directly or indirectly taxed to maintain. It was in the year 1868—a time when Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Horace Greeley, Lucy Stone, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Julia Ward Howe, George William Curtis, and others were making every effort to obtain the right for women to stand on an equality with men industrially and socially, as well as politically—that the New England Woman's Club took shape in the house of Dr. Harriot K. Hunt at Boston.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among its first recorded officers were Mrs. N. P. Willis (the poet's wife), Miss Elizabeth Peabody, Miss Lucy Goddard, Mrs. Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Mrs. Julia Ward Howe. Miss Louisa Alcott was one of its distinguished members. The aim of the club was to establish a place of meeting, and to inaugurate a "series of re-unions from which the members might derive intellectual and moral benefit and social enjoyment." To these, however, another object was added, and that was "social reform." The club was to be not only a place of pleasure and convenience to themselves, but one "whence some good should come to others."

That the work women do in their clubs is always vital, is shown by the haste with which they make their societies into what have been called "cradles of reform." There are clubs the work of which lies mainly in the line of attempting the reformation of those of their sex who have fallen victims to intemperance in drink. This is the work of the Charity Club of Boston, Mass. Most of them have no special line of philanthropy laid down, but have their committees on education, philanthropy, political and social science, ethical culture, reform, literature, lectures, entertainments, and the like. How women contrive to mix up economics with their other club work is well demonstrated by the Old and New Club of Malden, Mass. The chief object of this organization is "mutual improvement;" and the members say that this purpose is best carried out by giving every member an equal chance in carrying on the business of the club. So rotation in office is one of its rules. As the club has a hundred members, and the meetings are conducted in strict accordance with parliamentary law, considerable experience is acquired in performing public duties. "This," says Mrs. Harriet H. Robinson, one of the principal founders of the club, "is necessary, as we do not know how soon any of us may be called to take an active part in the events of the time, and it behooves us to prepare ourselves, and to help other women to be ready also." She holds that the "mission of the women's clubs is to fit the sex for the larger duties which are so surely coming into their lives." These words seem significant of New England, the home of the "Pilgrim Mothers," where one expects to find, by the laws of heredity, high thinkers and active doers; yet this temper is confined to no one part of the country, but is the general characteristic of women's clubs everywhere. But, if the clubs of any locality have advantages in this matter, they are the clubs in New York City, where the movement had the greatest necessity for existence and growth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first women's club of which we have any knowledge, that was formed without any counsel with men, and did not admit them to their meetings, was Sorosis, a club established in New York in 1868. Among those responsible for its birth were Mrs. Charlotte Wilbur, Miss Kate Field, Mrs. Demarest, and Mrs. Jennie C. Croly, better known under her *nom de plume* of "Jennie June." The *raison d'être* of this society, as embodied in its Certificate of Incorporation, was the "promotion of agreeable and useful relations among women of literary, artistic, and scientific tastes; the discussion and dissemination of principles and facts which promise to exert a salutary influence on women and society; and the establishment of an order which shall render the female sex helpful to each other, and actively benevolent in the world." As the women composing the club were nearly all connected with some one or other of the broad movements of the time, it was considered advisable not to discuss partisan politics or sectarian theology; and the members would not pledge themselves to any special form of work in the club, philanthropic or other, but committees were formed to act outside, and bring in their separate reports. Thus the meetings were pleasant re-unions, where tales were told of work done, and the impetus was given for new experiments in co-operative labors for pleasure or reform. The earliest work of Sorosis was in the line of economics. It made the first investigations into the conditions of shop-girls in New York and the exactions of employers, and the conditions of foundling asylums, and published such full reports of the latter as led to the establishment of two hospitals for deserted waifs in New York City. In the matter of woman's higher education, Sorosis, alive to their needs, drew up the first report to the University of the City of New York, and to the president and trustees of Columbia College, asking that these seats of learning be opened to women, and pointing out what had been done for them in that direction in other lands. One of the results of this impulse was an Association for the Advancement of Women, the "Women's Congress," as it is frequently called. The latest important work of Sorosis was the calling of a convention of clubs in 1889 from all portions of the United States, with the further idea of forming a federation of these societies. To this call about 117 clubs responded; and now the General Federation of Women's Clubs exists, which includes bodies from Maine to California and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, uniting them as far as possible in one bond of mutual sympathy and usefulness.

Besides these 117 affiliated clubs, many other organizations exist;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but since many of them are never heard of, no idea can be formed of the number of women's societies. One instance that shows the impossibility of making any correct estimate is given by the town of Wichita, Kan. In this place of forty thousand inhabitants it was deemed desirable some time since to find out how many women's organizations there were; and the result was that forty-two were found. Only two clubs in Wichita had joined the federation at the start; and so, but for this inquiry, the rest would have remained unknown until time disclosed the value of co-operation, and led them to fall in line with their sister clubs in the federation. The supposition is, that when the returns come in from all the country, in place of one hundred, the roll of women's clubs will mount into the thousands.

It might be expected that the work of so many clubs would be based on diversified lines of activity, and that these would represent the thought of the several geographical sections. In the East the clubs do a vast amount of philanthropic work, which has widened from purely economic labors to industrial performance. As the conditions of life became harder for women in America, and more of them were forced to become bread-winners, the clubs added to their list of aims the free teaching of old and new avocations. In the Southern towns, where the stress of poverty too often exists, associated bodies of women are frequent, whose aims are philanthropic, benevolent, and educational; but the conservatism, and almost Oriental timidity, of the sex in that portion of the country, prevents them from naming their gatherings by so radical a name as "clubs." There are, however, exceptions, such as the New Orleans Woman's Club, which is as advanced as any women's organizations elsewhere. Its objects are the removal of the line of caste (women of every rank in life belonging to it, and enjoying each other's companionship), and intellectual growth, which is helped by means of lectures, classes in music, art, literature, languages, and industrial teaching. In the West, where the settlements of men are more sparse, and food is plentiful, the clubs are rarely philanthropic. The most of them are of a social and literary character. Because public amusements are fewer, and libraries less accessible, the women of the Western towns devote their energies to aiding these factors of civilization. In almost every case, an association of women in Kansas, Wisconsin, Iowa, or elsewhere, means a club for the promotion and guidance of pleasure among the young, and the collecting, studying, and circulating of good books.. In many cases the club is utilized as a means of pursuing the education given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by colleges, or that part which relates to literature. Thus the Ladies' Afternoon Club of Janesville, Wis., makes a study of the great empires of the world as comprised in the history of their art, ethnology, philology, religions, and literatures. In far-off North Dakota, during the midst of the great blizzard of 1884 a literary club was started. Its first attempt was to try to gain a comprehensive idea of the life, manners, and customs of the city of London from its beginning to the present day. As ten pages of a good book properly read are said to give a liberal education, so students reading on these lines are likely to get far advanced on the questions of present as well as past times.

One token of the broader culture that women gained through this associated work was, that it made so large a number of clubs as 117 ready to answer the call of Sorosis for co-operative effort. This evidence of a solidarity of sentiment among women for centralizing their endeavors, was as unexpected to the outside world as it was grateful to the promoters of the scheme of a national federation. Men had so often asserted that women lacked the power of combining for large definite purposes, that they had come to believe themselves unable to work together, except in the small ways involving personal or doctrinal matters. And yet observation of what women have done in the way of co-operative work in the past twenty-five years proves them to have a natural gift for administration and organization. Despite their so recent experience in legislative matters, they seem to have grasped intuitively the necessity of centralizing their forces. The constant tendency in all their associated work has been to group local clubs under one head, to unite these again under some central or State control, and then to form a national council, and in some cases international departments.

An illustration of the comprehensive view taken by the "gentler sex," of the power obtained by mutual co-operation, was exhibited in the International Council of Women held at Washington in 1888. At this conference, fifty-three different organizations were represented by eighty speakers, sent as delegates from England, France, Norway, Denmark, Finland, India, Canada, and the United States. All but four of these organizations were of national scope, and those four were of national value. One of the great purposes in calling this council together was, as its leaders said, "that it might result in an international association that should henceforth hold itself in readiness to communicate with every possible organization in every possible country on the face of the globe." Following this international council was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a national one, held also in Washington, in 1891. In both these, among other demands was one that there should be as general and liberal provision for the professional and industrial training of women as for men; that women should receive equal pay for equal work; and that the endeavor be made to secure legislative action to enforce woman's economic rights to a higher standard of wages.

The calling together of these councils, with much of the radical thought expressed in them, was the work of the woman suffrage societies. These formerly despised bands, that were confined to a small section of New England, have spread, until there is scarcely a State in the Union without its woman's rights organizations, in which its members meet on the true club idea of uniting for the purpose of gaining one common end.

In later years the woman suffrage societies have had their power still further strengthened by the support of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. This organization, which is the largest incorporated society of women in the United States, soon saw the policy of helping to gain the franchise for the sex. "Only," said they, "through woman's ballots will America be delivered nationally from the dram-shops." To realize what this assistance means, it is simply necessary to consider that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has regularly organized societies in forty-four States of the Union and in every Territory except Alaska. It counts ten thousand local unions with a membership and following, inclusive of children, of about half a million. It owns its own publishing-house, which is a stock company; and its business manager, editors, directors, and stock-holders are all women. It sends out yearly enough temperance literature to give occupation to 146 employees, who are mostly women. Singularly enough, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which is to-day one of the most perfectly systematized of organizations, is the outgrowth of that mob of sentimental enthusiasts who perpetrated the "Woman's Crusade,"—a crusade wherein, amid the peal of church-bells and the singing of hymns, soft jewelled hands and hard ones met in the work of turning the contents of saloons into the gutters. It was from the experience gained in this fight, that women learned the value of organization, and that difficult issues must be met before the temperance movement could succeed. One of their discoveries was, that they must begin at the beginning, with the children; and they have triumphed so far, that laws have been secured in thirty of the States, requiring a place in the curriculum of the public schools

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the study of the relation of liquor to hygiene. Thus, while the aims of the "white ribbon party" are specifically directed against the use, manufacture, and sale of intoxicants, an indirect line in their progress involves the employment of social, educational, and political means as aids to its ends.

Another modern organization, and one with which the women's suffrage and temperance societies affiliate, is the Woman's Alliance, organized in Illinois in 1888. Unlike those societies that were each founded for the purpose of carrying out a special idea, the Alliance is cosmopolitan in its character. The club motto is "Justice to children—loyalty to women;" and its work, as might be expected, is altogether economic. One great distinction between the Alliance and other organizations of women is, that men give it their moral support. In Chicago it is said to be backed with the twenty-five thousand votes of the Trades Unions and Labor Assemblies. It has brought about, among other measures, the appointment in Chicago of the only police-women in the world. The duties of these are to inspect establishments where women and children are employed; and a silver star, which is their badge, admits them everywhere. In spite of the mayor, the Alliance secured the admission of an extra woman on the Board of Education, and has been successful generally with the things with which it concerns itself. Every thing about the Alliance shows that the women are not wedded to conservative ideas. Organizations of men join it by sending women delegates; and the platform is broad enough for such different bodies to meet on it, as masonic lodges, labor unions, Christian science associations, aid societies, and the like. In all their work the modern thought is uppermost, of practical things to be done to benefit humanity as a whole in its social estate. Standing committees organize the members according to the political divisions of the city; and these do such valuable work as attending the county court on those days when homeless children are assigned to private institutions, seeing to the sanitation of schoolhouses, insane-asylums, and jails. The success of the Alliance in accomplishing factory reforms, and similar reforms, is a proof of what good work can be done when men and women act together for the same things in the same directions, in place of pulling separately and in different ways.

In all these societies the religious element is held in abeyance, through a belief that, with better educational and living conditions, moral and spiritual forces will be developed. A large organization, however, has sprung up recently which reverses this order. From a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiritual basis it expects to lead its followers to the educational and practical. The King's Daughters, as its name implies, is an order that rests upon a scriptural foundation, and has met with the success of growing within five years from ten members to two hundred thousand. This shows that it has its place, and that it appeals to a sentiment still all-powerful in women. Although a religious order, whose watch-word is "In His Name," there is nothing about it to make it seem an anachronism amid the reform movements of the nineteenth century. In the first place, it is strictly unsectarian, as far as Christian creeds are concerned: in the second place, large numbers of its members are within the ranks of the other large organizations. Those at the head of the society consider it a "mighty educational force, to which no limit can be assigned to its power in the future as a factor in the comfort and regeneration of the world." The work done by the King's Daughters is that of education, temperance, home and foreign missions, charity, labor among working-women, men, boys, invalids, and Indians, and house-to-house work in the tenements. The order is international; and as the white ribbon badges of the apostles of the temperance cause are recognized all over the civilized world, so is the bow of royal purple with the silver cross attached, which is the emblem of the King's Daughters.

Also international, and resting on a scriptural foundation, are the Young Women's Christian Associations. The earliest of these societies was started in Boston in 1868. It became immediately popular; and one after the other of the large cities instituted branch societies, so that in 1891 the Association numbered 225 offshoots. There are now thirteen organized State Associations, with a membership of twelve thousand. In their work, the Young Women's Christian Associations endeavor to combine the religious, social, and practical. They carry out these aims by means of Bible study, entertainments, and free classes in the various industrial occupations by which the wage-workers gain their living. Instituted by Protestants, the Associations, keeping touch with the glorious spirit of the age, are entirely unsectarian in all the beautiful branches of work done in them. The only departure from this rule is made in the employment bureaus, where the regulations require that none but Protestants need apply.

Outside of these national organizations, which count their millions of adherents, the largest union of clubs is the federation of Working-Girls' Societies. This is an alliance of working-girls, which had its origin in a small club started some seven years ago by Miss Grace

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dodge, a woman of wealth and culture, and twelve factory and shop girls whom she termed her "friends." So successful was this little club, that ten similar ones were formed within a year, each one of which represented from thirty to two hundred and fifty women. These ten clubs were organized into an association, which took in other clubs as fast as they were formed. When other cities followed suit, all these were grouped into a federation. The objects of these societies are to secure by mutual co-operation advantages not possible to individual effort, and to influence the coarse and ignorant of the sex by bringing them into intimate relations with the cultured and refined. This purpose is carried out by a sisterly union between women of all degrees in the social scale; by practical talks, lectures, entertainments, educational classes, and a club journal, to which all are expected to contribute, and give their views on the debatable topics of the industrial, political, and domestic world. The topics discussed in this way by working-women are of a range broad enough fairly to indicate that the sex is taking an interest in the events of the time without losing any of its womanliness. One of the most valuable things connected with these clubs, and common to all in the country, is the adherence they give to the doctrine of temperance. In no woman's club is liquor allowed: even on *fête* days, nothing stronger than lemonade is permitted, and on the occasion of a Sorosis banquet toasts are drunk with water, not with wine. Who may estimate the moral influence that even this one protest may have on the future destinies of the human race?

It is through this dominant thought of doing something active for bettering the condition of women, and consequently the rest of mankind, that—after many years of struggle, first by the woman suffrage societies, then by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and later by the agitation in the clubs—the sex has gained the right to vote on school matters in twenty-eight States in the Union; that women can serve in hospitals as physicians and nurses; that women have been allowed to protect the unfortunate of their own sex as matrons in police-stations, or, as in Chicago, in the city jails. In two States the right of equal suffrage has been granted, and in several others permission to vote on matters connected with municipal reform. Colleges which in former times denied them the privilege of entrance have opened wide their doors to let them gain the knowledge they desire. These are some of the actual gains of a class of beings to whom was denied the right, at one time, to learn the alphabet.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor, in her anxiety to reach up to the higher branches of learning, has woman neglected the lower. Froebel clubs have been started for the teaching of the kindergarten system for the use of mothers; and numerous societies support free kindergartens for the purposes of raising to higher levels the children of the coming generations. This spirit of helpfulness has become so imbued with the life of the nation, that, turn which way one will, the outcome is embodied in material shape of some kind. And where the clubs have done nothing else, they have brought a sweeter, broader life to hundreds of women whose hearts and minds were running dry from lack of motive in existence, beyond that of working to live. To these the clubs have brought that soft mellowed happiness which comes only to those who spend themselves in the service of others.

The sole drawback to the beautiful work of the women's clubs is, that their influence as yet scarcely reaches far enough to take in the caste most in need of their labors, and that is the proletariat. Those who do come near enough to them have already been subject to some degree of cultivation. But for the great majority outside the clubs, and needing their help, there is only the hope of that reflex action which comes in the course of years. Some there are who have learned that the philanthropist must go out from her associations, and live the life of those she would serve. And this, too, is being done. In New York there is a club called the "College Settlement Girls," which has taken up its residence in the slums of the city, and whose members are endeavoring by their example and presence to bring something of the sweetness of their own culture—derived from Vassar, Wellesley, Smith, and Bryn Mawr Colleges—into the lives of their less fortunate neighbors. There are also other noble souls agitating, educating, and organizing under the banner of that social and economical re-organization, based upon scientific and philosophical principles, which will lead to incalculably great results.

Nothing is more lovely than this spirit of altruism which has taken possession of the time, and is leading woman, as she never was led before, to care for her sister-woman in the sense not only of duty, but of love, and which is urging her to bring about in so many ways a universal sisterhood of women, a reign of peace and happiness to all on earth.

ALICE HYNEMAN RHINE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## NEED SCHOOL BE A BLIGHT TO CHILD-LIFE?

THE most important advances in the field of natural development, for many years to come, will be owing not so much to the development of new ideas as to the more extended employment of methods which have already been tested, and approved by the scientists. The aim of this paper is to point out the advantages of such natural methods as are known to us, and to urge their adoption in the schools. I shall endeavor to show as clearly as my limited space will permit, in the first place, that, by the use of natural methods of teaching, the happiness of childhood may be preserved, in spite of the many hours of toil imposed upon the little ones, while, by the use of mechanical methods, those years which should be made happy are converted into years of drudgery and misery; and, in the second place, that the proper employment of natural methods depends upon a knowledge of how to use them (i.e., upon a proper training, both theoretical and practical, on the part of the teacher), as well as upon a course of instruction constructed in accordance with the natural laws of mental development. In my opinion, these two elements essential to natural development (namely, the proper training of the teacher, and a curriculum based upon psychological principles) can be assured only in case that those who manage school systems are themselves educationists.

My discussion will be practical, and consist of examples of teaching which I have had the opportunity to witness in various classrooms. I have selected for this purpose examples from two schools diametrically opposed in their methods, so that the contrast between natural and mechanical instruction may become clear. One of these is a school of Germany, where education is recognized among the sciences; and the other, a public school of New York City, a school belonging to a system conducted by laymen, thus proving that education is not recognized as a science in that city.

The German school to which I refer is located in the city of Elberfeld, Prussia, and the work I shall describe is that which I witnessed upon my visit to that school in March of last year. I first entered a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class-room containing thirty boys, and as many girls, of eight and nine years. I heard the teacher tell them that they were to have a geography-lesson, and that the lesson of the day would be upon the river which flows past the city of Elberfeld.

"Who can tell me something about this river?" asked the teacher. Sixty hands were raised; for all the children had seen it, and were glad of an opportunity to speak of it.

"How many children have seen where it rises?" A few had seen the place.

"How many more would like to see its origin?" All hands came up again.

"We shall try to find it this afternoon."

The children looked happy, for they were to go on an excursion. Upon signal they fell in line, and then left the building. As they walked through the streets two by two, they conversed quietly. After a few minutes they arrived at the bank of the river which they were to study. The teacher then put a few questions to them.

"Which way shall we go?" asked he.

"To the right," said one of the pupils.

"How do you know?"

"Because I have often seen the source."

Another said that water always flows downward, so that the origin of the river would be found by following the stream in the direction opposite to that in which it flows.

"What else have you noticed thus far?" asked the teacher. One child had noticed the direction of the wind; another, something in regard to new buildings, etc.

When the city limits had been passed, the teacher told the children that they might make a little more noise. A song was suggested, and the little ones sang and were merry. After a few minutes they spoke again, and said that they were rising more rapidly than before, that the trees were beginning to bud, that the grass was beginning to grow. They likewise pointed out a few mountain-streams. During this walk the children were never allowed to lose sight of the river, because that formed the main object of the lesson. One of the children said that the river was getting smaller. When asked for the reason of this, he remarked that they were above the places where it is fed by little streams. When they arrived at a railroad-bridge, they spoke of the cars, the destination of the trains, and something regarding the telegraph.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After a walk of an hour and a quarter, the children reached the top of the mountain. A view of the surrounding country was taken, special points noticed and spoken of, and then the source of the river was looked for in all directions. At last a child called out joyfully that he had found it. Sure enough, he had found, beneath some loose stones, the spring from which the river arises. All the children looked at it, played with the stones, and then ran around in the fields. After a while they gathered close to the teacher, sang a few more songs, and then fell in line for the homeward march. Three hours after leaving, the children returned to the schoolhouse.

The next morning the children discussed in the class-room the walk of the previous day. During this lesson their joy and enthusiasm knew no bounds. In answer to every question, every hand was raised. I asked the teacher why he did not keep the children seated quietly. He answered, "Why should I destroy their mental activity by compelling them to direct most of their attention towards controlling the movements of their muscles?"

As the lesson proceeded, I listened with astonishment to the enormous amount of things which the children related about their walk, and to the words which indicated the vividness of the impressions which these things had left upon their minds. The walk was intended primarily for a geography-lesson; but, besides learning something of geography, many other channels of thought had been opened to them. The children had seen trees bud: now they were anxious to see them bloom. They saw the farmer use the river for the irrigation of the soil: they were now desirous of observing the effect of this irrigation upon the crops.

Upon such walks, and the knowledge gained by means of them, the whole German system of elementary education is founded. This is true of large as well as of small cities. All the work centres upon the ideas gained in these walks, which serve not only as a means of introduction to the study of geography, but likewise to that of history; historical points being visited for this purpose. Further, by means of the various things noticed and spoken of upon these excursions, the children gather information on botany, geology, physics, astronomy, zoölogy, and other branches of science.

After the lesson just described, I visited the A B C class. When I entered, the children were having a combined language and memory lesson. They were acting a fairy-tale, and by means of this they learned how to speak loudly, distinctly, and correctly, enjoying them-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves at the same time. Next there was a drawing-lesson, during which the children were instructed in the drawing of straight lines by drawing a chair with three straight lines, a table with three lines, a picture-frame with four lines, a window with six lines, and so on. The drawing of familiar objects amused them, so they were all delighted with their drawing-lesson.

Next these children spoke of their experiences. They related what they had observed since the previous day. They spoke of the weather, and of the direction of the wind and its effect upon the weather; of the temperature registered upon their thermometers at home; of the position and phase of the moon; and of the time of rising of the sun. The children had planted seeds, and they related what progress their plants had made. Lastly they had an arithmetic-lesson, which was interesting because it was simple and practicable.

I then returned to the teacher who conducted the excursion, and asked him whether he found his task a difficult one.

"It is indeed difficult," he answered. "I have taught in nearly all classes, but have found none so difficult as those composed of very young children. In Germany, only those teachers who show a particular adaptability to this kind of work are given charge of the younger children."

"What was the extent of your training before you received your license to teach?" I asked him.

"I had a six-years' course at the seminary," he answered; "and during the last year I was obliged to teach from two to four hours weekly, under guidance. After this I received a temporary license to teach. A temporary license in Germany permits a teacher to teach for two years; but at the end of that period he is obliged to pass another examination,—the state examination,—which is very rigid. It was during the two years of probation that I began fully to realize the difficulties connected with proper teaching."

So much for the German school. I shall now speak of the school in New York City.

With the picture of those happy little children singing songs on the top of the mountain near the spring from which a little stream arises, I entered the A B C class of a New York public school. What did I find? Sixty children—with heads, arms, and legs fixed—staring at the teacher, who was talking to them at the time. All was silent as the grave, and the children resembled statues. Soon after I entered, a drawing-lesson was commenced. But the children did not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

draw objects, as in Elberfeld: they drew vertical, horizontal, and oblique lines. A lesson in number followed; and the children who had been in school but a short time were obliged to deal with large numbers, and in the most abstract manner. Next there was a language-lesson, during which the children learned how to pronounce the English language correctly by studying the philosophy of the elementary sounds in a manner intelligible only to mature minds. I asked the teacher when object-lessons were given. She said that object-lessons were the last to be considered, and that consequently but very little time could be devoted to them. She then, at my request, gave an object-lesson. She chose for the object a chair, and taught the children that a chair has a seat, four legs, and a back, and that it is used to sit upon—all of which they knew when they were three years old.

I next visited the lowest grammar grade in order to witness a geography-lesson. The children in this class had been studying geography no longer than seven or eight months, and they were already reciting the most abstract form of definitions: for example, "The axis of the earth is an imaginary line running through its centre, upon which it revolves;" "A zone is an imaginary belt extending around the earth;" and so on. But the children saw nothing of fields, trees, and rivers. Although there are few places so well adapted to the objective study of geography as New York City,—where there are within easy reach islands, rivers, hills, lakes, a sound, a bay, an ocean, and a magnificent harbor,—yet the children attending the public schools of that city are obliged to study between four walls, from globes and maps, those things which they might so conveniently and advantageously study from nature.

I ask my readers to pardon a moment's digression. I have frequently been told that it would be unsafe for teachers to take children out of the school-buildings in New York City, on account of the bustle in the streets. Why it should be less safe to do so in New York than in Berlin (where geographical walks are regularly taken), I fail to comprehend. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that such walks are dangerous in large American cities, they are certainly perfectly safe in cities having less than, say, a hundred thousand inhabitants; and eighty-five per cent of the inhabitants of the United States live in cities containing less than this number of people: therefore the smaller American cities could readily follow the German system of teaching children from nature. With few exceptions, how-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever, this plan is not carried out systematically, even in American villages.

I asked one of the teachers of the school of which we have just been speaking, why she so completely suppressed the natural muscular activity of her pupils.

"I am compelled to do so," she answered. "If I do not secure perfect silence and attention, I cannot teach the children all that they are obliged to learn during a specified period of time."

"But is this natural?" I inquired. "Is it natural that a little child who has always been perfectly free, should, immediately after entering school, be obliged to spend five hours a day in an attitude suitable for the taking of his photograph; and this upon a hard bench and in a funereal atmosphere?"

"Certainly not," she replied; "but I can get the required results in no other way. I myself do not think that it is very harmful to the children, as they have calisthenic exercises so frequently."

It is true the children did get such exercises from time to time, in order that they might shake the stiffness out of their limbs; but, when I saw how these exercises were performed, I was reminded of the movements made by a dog when he shakes the water off his body after coming out of a bath.

"What was the extent of your professional training before you received your license to teach?" I asked the teacher.

"I spent four years at the Normal College of this city," she replied.

"And during this time did you receive any practical training?"

"Yes, I spent ten weeks in the Training School."

"Did you teach all that time?"

"No; but I was present when others taught."

"And did you not teach at all before you received your license?"

"Yes, I taught some. I gave twelve lessons before I received my license."

This closes the description which I intended giving of the work of the class-rooms; and I hope that I may have succeeded, by means of it, in rendering clear the marked contrast between the natural and the mechanical methods of instruction. I have likewise endeavored to emphasize the fact that in the German school, where the teaching was carried on in a natural manner, the teachers were well trained, and the curriculum so constructed that the children began with the concrete; while in the New York public school, where the teaching was me-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chanical, the teachers were practically untrained, and the curriculum so arranged that the children began with the abstract. In the case of the former, the ideas were given to the child in a digestible form,—in a form which, by their ready assimilation by the mind, gave pleasure to the child; while in the latter the ideas were indigestible, and the work consequently so unattractive to the child that it was essential to put him under the influence of mesmerism—how otherwise can we explain the statue-like condition of the naturally active child?—before he could be made to receive them. And when we search for the ultimate reason why the German children were developed naturally, while those of New York were instructed mechanically, we find that, in Germany, education is regulated more or less by scientists, while in New York it is conducted altogether by laymen. For examples of the manner in which laymen conduct the educational system of New York City, I would refer my readers to two letters which appeared in "The New York Herald" of September 14 and 28, 1890, respectively; the former by Mr. Stephen A. Walker, an ex-president, and the latter by Mr. DeWitt J. Seligman, an ex-member, of the Board of Education.

In conclusion, I repeat what I expressed in the beginning: namely, that childhood will be benefited more by the energies directed towards the extension of the use of the good in the old than by those directed towards the development of the new; for it is not, as we have seen, owing to lack of knowledge of the laws of development, that natural education advances so slowly, but to the fact that children are educated by those who do not possess this knowledge. If, therefore, life be made a burden instead of a pleasure to the child, the blame falls, not upon the natural consequences of an age which makes such heavy demands upon him, but upon those persons who fail to place their children in the hands of individuals who know how to educate them without destroying their happiness.

J. M. Rice.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# A DAY WITH LORD TENNYSON.

WHEREVER I pass, in the literary and intellectual circles of America, I find a very strong curiosity existing to know more about Lord Tennyson. Such a curiosity appears most natural, and I should myself share it if I were an American, and had not already the honor and pleasure of knowing the illustrious poet laureate of England. I am not exactly sure what position he occupies in the estimation of other countries, and especially of the Republic of the United States, but for us he has long ago attained the supreme position of representing in a most perfect and accepted manner the best thought and the finest poetical music of the Victorian era.

Circumstances of life—which without making him wealthy have given him easy years, and freedom from social and political necessities—seem to have combined with his genius and surroundings to create for him an almost ideal poetical existence. Secluded from public affairs without indifference to them, and maintaining from first to last the reserve and repose of the ideal minstrel, he takes little or no part in controversy, although as a peer of the realm he might at any time occupy his seat in the House of Lords, and vote. But in heart he is a very strong patriot and imperialist, although his love for England, and pride in her greatness, are mingled with the sincerely liberal principles of the age. Peer of the realm although he be, it is he that has written these lines:—

> "A simple maiden in her flower
> Is worth a hundred coats-of-arms;"

and all his writings breathe a large spirit of sympathy for the advance and welfare of the peoples at large.

In regard of his poetical works, his fame already stands too high for panegyric; and times to come will surely confirm the contemporary verdict which places him in the front rank of English singers; side by side, indeed, with the greatest names. No man, with the exception of Shakspere, has wielded with greater vigor, grace, and variety that noblest metre of the English language, the blank verse, the use and value of which Lord Tennyson may almost be said to have revived.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nowadays a great deal is written, and very well written, which is in the same vein, and has some echo of the majesty and force of the master; but it is largely imitative; and, as Tennyson himself has written,—

"Most can raise the flowers now,
For all have got the seed."

Beyond question, English literature has become immeasurably enriched by such splendid monuments of verse as "The Idylls of the King," "Œnone," "The Death of Arthur," "Enoch Arden," "The Lotos-Eaters," "The Princess," and other well-known productions; while the "In Memoriam"—albeit M. Taine finds fault with it for its finish, and delicate analysis of grief—is certainly a very mirror of the inner feelings of the Victorian age, with its mingled intellectual doubts and spiritual desires. In lyrical verse, again, Lord Tennyson has shown himself a worthy successor to the best masters of the lighter lyre. A score of lovely songs are familiar to all lips and hearts from his pen; nor has he lost, even at this day, the subtle gift of making his words their own music. Even in his most recent lines, the same old charm is visible of exquisite phraseology and far-fetched melody. Who else but he, in the "Ode to Virgil," would have so well characterized the Æneid, saying of it,—

"All the charms of all the Muses often flowering in a lonely word"?

And in his recent "Ode to Spring," how finely he speaks of the kingfisher as—

"The secret splendour of the brooks"!

Apart, therefore, from his high position as laureate of England, and successor in the high dynasty which has seen Dryden, Southey, and Wordsworth wearing the purple of poetry, Lord Tennyson's personality may well interest all cultivated minds in all parts of the Anglo-Saxon world; and, having been asked to give some closer particulars of his habit and surroundings, I comply not unwillingly with the request.

Lord Tennyson lives, so to speak, in two houses. He divides the year between his seaside abode at Freshwater, in the Isle of Wight, and his residence on the top of Blackdown, in Surrey, named "Aldworth." His house at Freshwater, which he occupies in the winter, is placed near to the sea, in a very charming locality under a great green down, which shields it from the breezes of the Channel, while opening the view towards Freshwater and Alum Bay. The house, comfortable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without pretension, is surrounded by a thick-set garden and groves of fir-trees, where—

"The magpies gossip
Garrulous under a roof of pine."

If you mount the down, a magnificent seascape opens, extending up and down the English Channel; while close by, the pointed and picturesque chalk-crags known as "The Needles" project into the green sea in a row of white pinnacles; and round behind the cape thus formed opens the sweep of Alum Bay with its variegated cliffs painted all sorts of colors by the differing tints of the sand. The village of Freshwater is old-fashioned, and not very populous; nor are there many houses in the vicinity of the poet's retirement, which he maintains with a good deal of strictness, having found himself in former days somewhat overwhelmed by his own popularity. There are amusing stories related, of desperately enthusiastic attempts to invade his seclusion; and he himself tells jokingly how he has sometimes strategically defeated these too friendly assaults. But no man is more hospitable to his accepted friends; and when I have passed his island gate, afraid to disturb him, and therefore contented with sending in my card and message of good will, I have found myself chased by a mounted messenger to my very inn, and my return insisted upon with gentle tyranny.

In the winter the air at Freshwater blows soft and warm from the sea, sheltered as the locality is from the north and east; nor can it be doubted that the poet laureate has derived immense physical benefit from his custom of changing half yearly from the mild winter of the Channel to the pleasant summer amid the heather of Aldworth. In May or June of each year, he has been in the habit of repairing to his lovely eyry in Surrey, which stands on ground five or six hundred feet above the sea-level, in the midst of very characteristic rural scenery.

If you are going to visit the poet, you will alight at the quiet little rural station of Haselmere; and if the day be fine by no means will you take a carriage, but enjoy the pleasant walk from the station to the house. It is a distance of about three miles, slightly ascending all the way. You wind out of the ancient township by a country road which soon plunges into the deep shadow of pine-thickets and nut-bushes. After about a mile of this cool verdant shadow, you emerge upon an upland, where the trees almost cease and the soil is covered near and far with the heather and the gorse. In early summer and in midsummer the heather will not be in blossom. When its tiny bells do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

break, the whole country-side is clad with a purple bloom, making it resemble the hills of Scotland, and display even a more charming aspect than the wild lilac azaleas produce, which make the hills of Japan sheets of heavenly color. But, if the heather be not yet in blossom, the gorse will be out with its flowers of burning gold; so beautiful, although so common, that it is said Linnæus, the great botanist, on first sight of an English moorland covered with furze and gorse in flower, fell down upon his knees and gave thanks to God for such a spectacle.

The soil hereabouts is rather hopeless for general agricultural or floral purposes, being what is called "chert," an inexorable mixture of flint and sand; and on most of these beautiful but barren hills you would have to dig five or six hundred feet to find water. I myself owned some years ago forty or fifty acres on Hind Head, an eminence of a thousand feet above the sea, opposite to Lord Tennyson's place; but my children, for whose sake I purchased it, found the locality so lonely, and the difficulty about water so great, that we had to abandon it. Yet where soil can be made, or has accumulated by the rain-washings of many years, large trees and plentiful breadth of thickets may be grown, as at Aldworth itself. The country is profoundly quiet. In all my three-miles' walk from the station to the laureate's gateway I encountered only a little maid, who put me on the right road, and a pair of lovers earnestly talking under the nut-trees by a gateway, to whom, as was quite clear, I and all the world—including Lord Tennyson and every living soul but each other—were matters of absolute indifference.

At the elevation now reached the view is superb, and in its kind could probably not be surpassed in any part of the world. You gaze over a large portion of the counties of Surrey and Hampshire, and under the glorious summer sun, with the rich English cultivation of the plains beneath, it is all like some vast enchanted garden. No land is richer than our own in country flowers; and the side of the road will be profusely ornamented with harebells, the wild dragon's-mouth, foxglove,—which is really "folk's-glove," the glove of the little fairy people,—celandine, the great horse-daisies, and golden-rod. The swallows love the fine air of these elevations, and skim backwards and forwards over every hollow where the rain-water has lodged; while, emulous of their human rival, the larks are singing against each other from the clouds. Absorbed in the charm and interest of these sights and sounds, you have almost forgotten to think of the road,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when suddenly a large wayside board is observed, inscribed "private," and you come to a roadway in the side of the down, leading, evidently, to a private residence. Traversing this for about half a mile, you emerge upon the open plateau, but even then observe no residence. The spot is a round bare down covered with blackberry, furze-bushes, and stunted pines, with, down in the hollow, a black mass of larger fir-trees, and amid them the point of a chimney. This is Aldworth. The gateway stands wide open, and you walk by a broad pathway to the porch of the modest and by no means ostentatious abode. It is an English villa of ample proportions and pleasing elevations, such as any country gentleman might build for himself, yet in no way remarkable for size or embellishment. In front of it extends a large and well-kept lawn surrounded by beds richly adorned with flowers of all sorts, for the soil has been thoroughly conquered here, and Lord Tennyson's home lies embowered in trees and shrubs of all kinds, and parterres bright with all sorts of blossoms. When the house was built, some ten or fifteen years ago, the poet was almost as solitary upon the breezy summit as Robinson Crusoe in his island; and even later, when I reared a little house upon Hind Head, the place, as I have said, was so lonely that my children found it untenable. But since then Londoners have discovered this region of beauty and salubrity. The illustrious Professor Tyndall has built himself a house on that wonderfully picturesque edge of Hind Head where the Devil's Punch Bowl opens its great cup; and you can see from Lord Tennyson's garden the domicile of the great philosopher and savant. Given water and soil, any thing and every thing will grow in the divine air breathing about the spot. I observed in the garden Japanese maples and the dwarf bamboo; while the portico and façade are covered with rich climbing wistaria and the purple clematis. A grave waiting-man opens the ample door, accompanied by two or three dogs, who seem accustomed to the approach of visitors, and are ready to extend the hospitalities of the place to them in advance.

I am not expected to-day, therefore send in my card to the Hon. Hallam Tennyson, beseeching him, if Lord Tennyson be asleep or indisposed, not on any account to allow him to be interrupted by mention of my name: it will be enough to enter and smoke a pipe with him. The answer is brought by the poet's son in person, who tells me that his father is taking a morning nap, but would never forgive him if I were permitted to depart before he awakes. We therefore go up stairs to an upper chamber, where Mrs. Tennyson, Hallam, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I sit for a long time, talking of old and new days, and old and new books. Like his illustrious father, Mr. Tennyson is a great smoker, and his amiable wife makes no objection to the friendly incense which we pour upon the breeze entering by the open window. Lunch is finished, and one or two neighbors arrive, intimate friends well acquainted with the habits of the poet, and knowing that he will soon arise from his mid-day rest, and be ready to receive them. Presently Hallam Tennyson reports to us that his father is up and dressed, and will be glad to see us in his dressing-room. We are only three or four in number, accustomed to the ways and wishes of the poet, and we quietly descend into the large study, where behind a screen, on the sofa, the poet laureate sits awaiting us.

Everybody knows by photograph the manner of man he is,—surely a beautiful face, if ever the adjective could be applied to masculine features, and never more beautiful in any stage of life than now, when age has fixed all the finer features, and lent them a new dignity and majesty. Everybody is familiar with the broad forehead, the clear, deep eyes, the strongly cut nose, and finely chiselled lips, the long hair fringing those temples,—shrines of high thought,—and the genial, massive, and commanding aspect of the poet. Albeit past his eighty-second birthday, Lord Tennyson's figure is only weakened, not broken, by age. His hair preserves much of its old, dark color, and, excepting in places, is hardly more than "sable-silvered." His spirit is as alert, his glance as keen and alight, as ever. Though he does not rise upon our entrance, making no ceremony with friends, he leads at once an animated conversation. It is a summer day, or rather early autumn; but the weather has been chilly, and the winds are blowing from that dismal quarter the east, so that the poet is wearing a loose wrapper, and around his neck a white silk handkerchief loosely knotted. By the way, on the left side of his neck there lodges a small brown birthmark, very characteristic, as if a drop of dark wine had dropped there, and had stained the skin. His hands are manly and powerful in outline, but delicate and finely formed, as those of a poet should be. On his head, as an additional protection from the caprices of the English weather, he wears a small black velvet cap. These precautions are the more necessary, because not long ago he was suffering sadly from rheumatism and bronchitis, which at one time, indeed, filled all his friends with anxiety, and became for weeks together a national concern. To-day he is quite recovered, but must still be guarded against any chill. And a certain shadow overhangs the hospitable abode,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moreover, from the illness of Lady Tennyson (always a great invalid, but recently and to-day in positive danger), so that our first inquiries are made in an anxious and subdued tone; nor does the conversation fairly commence till we have been a little re-assured by the last report of the doctor. We shall not see the gentle face of the poet's wife to-day, she is hopelessly imprisoned in her room; but upon the wall hangs a charming portrait of her in oils, by Watts, and she is known far and wide for her kindness of heart and graceful charities.

Tennyson is, of course, a very great master of the noble language which he has so largely adorned. In Lincolnshire, his native county, the purest English in the world is spoken—with, to my mind, one exception, for I think I have heard the same English as correctly used in Boston, New England. If I am right, it is a strange coincidence that the capital of Massachusetts, peopled from the fens of England, and representing the names of its towns, should also preserve the purest traditions of English speech. Possibly it is to this that Lord Tennyson's poems owe some of their extreme perfection of English. But he is master of the dialects and *patois* of his mother-tongue as well, and he interested us greatly by imitating the Lincolnshire rural talk, and also that of the south and west of England. If he chose, he could obviously write whole books in the dialect of his "Northern Farmer;" for whatever he did would probably make them and us say,—

"I thowt a said whot a owt to 'a said an' I coom'd awaäy."

Over and over again he challenged us to make out sentences and stories recited by him in these country phrases, and more than once, I am sorry to say, with absolute triumph. It would have been easier to understand Japanese and Chinese than the shibboleths of some of our shires, quite familiar, nevertheless, to this deep student of English. He agreed with me in my earnest praise of the English language as an instrument now become almost perfect for the uses of the orator, the philosopher, the historian, and the poet; but when I observed that by the help of America it was destined to become the common speech of the world, he laughingly shook his head, and said, "That is very bad for us." At first I did not understand the drift of this observation; but he went on to remark, "When a language dies out, like Latin and Greek and your black Sanscrit, the literary monuments contained in it are, so to speak, embalmed. They remain standards; and all ages, in proportion as people master these dead classics, admire them, form their style upon them, and perpetuate the memory and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

name of the bygone writers. But when a language endures, it gradually changes; and the time will come, Arnold, when you and I will be as difficult for Englishmen and Americans to read and understand as Chaucer is to-day." This was quite a new view, and I tried to combat it by declaring that Shakspere and the great Elizabethans seemed to have fixed the classic standard of the language; but he would not have it. There is indeed about him what I should call a soft arrogance, a gentle despotism of will and word, which is very characteristic of, and indeed becoming to, a man whose position in letters and the education of human thought is so unquestionably established. He does not readily admit contradiction, nor easily accept views not fitting in with his own. I was pleased and surprised to hear him quote a Persian verse of Hafiz with perfect accuracy of pronunciation; and that led us to speak of the many words incorporated into English from the Persian and other Oriental languages, such as "balcony," "nectarine," "canopy," and the like.

More and more I notice the influence of Oriental languages spreading in our literature, which is very natural, seeing how largely we touch the East by our empire. Lord Dufferin, when he was viceroy of England, amused the leisure of his state by learning Persian, which he came at last fluently to command, so as to be able to make a speech in the court language of Asia to the Afghan Ameer and Sirdars assembled on the north-west frontier. The Viceroy told me that he learned Persian by getting a translation of "Robinson Crusoe" written out of it in the Roman characters, and walking round and round his large garden at Calcutta, with the *munshi*, or interpreter, reading its pages to him till he had learned them. Speaking of India would recall to me a great deal that passed between us about that country's literature, if I had time or space to recount it; but it also reminds me of the heavy loss which the poet laureate sustained in the death, in that country, of his eldest son, Lionel Tennyson, who expired while I was in India on a tour; and I remember to have had the honor repeatedly of leading his wife to the Viceroy's dinner-table in days when he was lying sick at Delhi, but we had no anticipation of the melancholy issue of the malady.

Mr. Lionel Tennyson recovered sufficiently to reach Calcutta, and embark for England, but died on the voyage, and was buried, I think, at Aden. His wife was the daughter of Frederick Locker, a very accomplished writer of social verses; and in days when no offspring had been born to Hallam, his second son, the poet laureate regarded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lionel's wife as a new and dear daughter, destined, as he hoped, to be the mother of the heir to his title. Lionel's untimely death shattered these hopes, and his widow has since made a remarriage. But a child has been born to Hallam, and this little family, of course, shares the roof-tree and the daily life of his lordship. I fancy I am right in saying that the fatal chill taken by Lionel, and ending so mournfully, occurred at the great review in Delhi. We had out all the troops there in presence of the kings and princes of India. It was a very great occasion, Lord Dufferin himself taking the chief part; and Sir Frederick Roberts, the hero of Kandahar, commanded the forces. Unfortunately a very heavy rain fell at the beginning of the manœuvres, and the gorgeous uniforms worn were naturally shielded by waterproofs and martial cloaks. At the signal to commence, a Russian *aide-de-camp* who was present made some remark—the reverse of complimentary—about the way in which the warlike fineries of the British staff were being covered up to protect them for holiday use. His words, which very likely were more facetious than malignant, came somehow to Lord Dufferin's ears, who instantly, in his quick and easy manner, dropped his large rain-cloak to the ground by the side of his charger. Everybody, in spite of the pelting deluge, was of course bound to imitate the example set by his Excellency; and the consequence was, that a great many people got one of those thorough drenchings which in India, if not quickly repaired, lead too often to the chill, the ague, and the fever.

After a while, when we had contemplated all the books in the study, and looked at engravings, pictures, works of art, etc., we went down to tea, Lord Tennyson walking with a firm step, although somewhat touched by his years. He questioned me a great deal about Japan, a country in which he takes much interest. "What color are the Japanese people?"—"Brown, my lord," I said. "Oh, nonsense! brown?" he answered. "I am brown. Look at my hands and face and neck! But" (drawing up his coat-sleeve and shirt, he bared a large white fore-arm) "see," he said, "I am as white as a sheet in my body."—"Well, then," I said, "Lord Tennyson, call them amber."—"Ah!" he said, "now I comprehend. No doubt that is the Japanese hue." He spoke, too, very much of America, which he would dearly like to visit if it were possible, and especially wished to see Niagara. "Not," he went on, "that that is the proper way to pronounce the word, for there is a line in Campbell that runs—

'Great Niagara, thundering o'er its edge.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Either we must be wrong, or Campbell. The name," he said, "means 'father of waters;' but which is father and which is waters I am utterly unable to say."

"For my part," I said, "I never want to see Niagara again. If it were encountered suddenly in the middle of a dark forest, it would be a memory to cherish, and a spot to revisit with deepest emotion time after time; but in spite of all modern improvements, it is decked out and embellished, and prepared for exhibition at present, in a manner that renders it as unattractive as a china shepherdess on the mantelpiece; and it has become, to my thinking, a piece of gigantic waterworks, good to see once, and never to be revisited." I protested that I could name a hundred waterfalls in India, Japan, Norway, Asia Minor, ten times more imposing to my thought, because still belonging to nature, and set in their original surroundings. He heartily laughed when I declared the best comment I had heard upon the famous cataract was that of the practical man who cried out at its first sight, "Well done, water!"

We naturally spoke of his own works. He reads them with admirable expression and power of interpretation, and has a private opinion that nobody else can give them proper utterance, especially his poem of "Maud," which I think he prefers. I rather audaciously combated this view, and recited several of his verses, with the result of wringing from him a confession that I also knew how to read Tennyson. He was led himself to repeat to us, in accents that I shall not easily forget, that lovely lyric in "The Princess:"—

"The splendour falls on castle walls
And snowy summits old in story:
The long light shakes across the lakes,
And the wild cataract leaps in glory.
Blow, bugle, blow, set the wild echoes flying,
Blow, bugle; answer, echoes, dying, dying, dying.

. . . . . .

"O love, they die in yon rich sky,
They faint on hill or field or river:
Our echoes roll from soul to soul,
And grow for ever and for ever.
Blow, bugle, blow, set the wild echoes flying,
And answer, echoes, answer, dying, dying, dying."

Truly the echoes of Lord Tennyson's song will live forever and forever, and roll from soul to soul. I do not wonder at the serene

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self-possession, I had almost said the intellectual complacency, of the poet. He has achieved! Behind him lies the completed task of the spirit of the nineteenth century, especially in his own land, rendered articulate. Beyond all dispute he is the representative singer of the great reign of Victoria, having no doubt for worthy contemporaries, rather than rivals, such names as Browning, Swinburne, and those of one or two others; but by the sure judgment of posterity, as well as the reverence and estimation of his day, he reigns the laurelled king of English singers. The vein of humor visible in many of his writings, as, for example, in the "Plump Head Waiter of the Cock," comes forth in his conversation, which is full of bright anecdote and gay allusion, although he has endured terrible physical trials. When he told me that for eight months he had suffered sometimes to the point of despair from rheumatism and bronchitis, I could not but express my indignation at this common lot of suffering, saying, "My lord, it is a treason of nature that you should bear such griefs. When your time arrived, and not till then, the three queens in the barge should come for you, and waft you down to Camelot in the barge of King Arthur." At this he laughed, and shook his head.

Nothing could be more touching, more exemplary, than the devotion of his son, Hallam Tennyson, who is the daily and assiduous guardian of his illustrious father, foreseeing and anticipating every want, waiting on him with a tender, manly love which equals or surpasses any filial attachment I have seen. It is affection mingled with the deepest reverence and admiration, and nothing, therefore, is wanting in the poet's home which these can supply. Lord Tennyson seldom or never puts pen to paper in the way of correspondence; nor will he receive any but the closest intimates, or visitors who interest him. Hallam is the warden of his privacy, and conducts for him his necessarily large intercourse by letter with the world. He is married to a sweet and amiable lady whose love is also a solace and joy to the venerable laureate, and the music of a little one's laughter from time to time fills the house.

The dining-room where we were drinking tea is a large apartment with spacious windows giving splendid views over the country in two directions. From one casement you look over Hind Head and the roof of Professor Tyndall's abode, and down the valley that leads to Farnham. From another the prospect widens along the valley to Haselmere, and far away to the hills of Portsdown, overlooking the Solent. There is a point on the lawn from which it is easy to command

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a landscape sixty miles in diameter, and we caught a peep of the sea as far away up channel as Dungeness.

And now it was time to rise and make farewell, if the train was to be saved at Haselmere, when, to my surprise and pleasure, Lord Tennyson declared his intention of accompanying me part of the way. Hallam threw over his shoulders the great black cloak familiar to those who possess photographs of the poet, and taking a big stick, and two or three of the dogs, he set forth up the broad garden-path to trudge across the heath with me. The wind was blowing keenly, and Lord Tennyson was not quite free from his old enemy; but with fair strength and sturdiness he faced the gorse-clad hill, staying now and then, partly to recover breath, partly to complete some point of interest in his delightful conversation. "Hallam," he said, "have you a pencil? I want to hear that verse that Sir Edwin wrote under the window in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, since I myself was obliged to compose the first of the six."

"Oh! my lord," I answered, "you made the task very difficult for those who came afterwards. Archdeacon Farrar insisted that I should inscribe something under the last of the six windows, which is dedicated to the memory of Edward Lloyd, the great printer and newspaper man." —"What on earth did you make of that?" said Lord Tennyson. So, as we stood there on the heath, I repeated the four lines which I had composed in the street on meeting with my old school-fellow the Archdeacon, and on receiving from him an imperative demand for a quatrain, in the metre and style of the poet laureate's upon the first window. "This was the verse," I said, "into which I was ordered to introduce something about Mr. Lloyd and something about the press:—

> "'A master printer of the press, he spake
> By mouth of many thousand tongues. He swayed
> The pens that break the sceptres. Good Lord, make
> Thy strong ones faithful, and thy bold afraid.'"

Lord Tennyson repeated twice, "'The pens that break the sceptres! the pens that break the sceptres.' I like that, Sir Edwin!—Write that down, Hallam." Three-quarters of a mile from his gate the laureate drew up. "I have one thing to ask you," he said. "It was on this spot that I parted with General Gordon. He said that he wanted me to promote the interest of his Boys' Home. 'You, in all England,' Gordon exclaimed, 'are the man to do it.'" And Lord Tennyson added, "I wish I were."

The Gordon Boys' Home, I should say, is an institution founded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by our famous hero of Khartoum, and dedicated to the saving of little waifs and strays among the boy population, and to the manufacture of them into useful citizens and sturdy soldiers and sailors. It is an admirable establishment, which ought to be maintained with more generosity by the English people, but has been suffered to languish for lack of funds. "Get me, if you can," said Lord Tennyson, "forty thousand pounds to set that home upon its legs."—"I will try," was my answer, "if you will send me a letter which I can publish." And since then the effort has been made, and I hope, from what I have learned from the secretary, Sir Dighton Probyn, that the English public will not allow this institution, which is the best monument to the memory of Gordon, to fall into feebleness.

"Come again and come often!" said Lord Tennyson, grasping my hand at the summit of the hill. And when he turned to walk back with Hallam to his garden-gate, I forgot all about the times of the trains, and lingered long amid the furze-bushes, watching the flutter of his black cloak, and the receding figure of the great singer whose majestic and melodious verse has furnished expression for the thoughts of the century, and to whom there may be a successor, but will never be a worthy substitute, when the time comes for the descent to another head of—

> "Those laurels greener from the brows
> Of him that uttered nothing base."

EDWIN ARNOLD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## ESTIMATES OF NEW BOOKS.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TRAVEL.—As the result of notes and information gathered during his four-years' residence in Switzerland as minister of the United States, Mr. Boyd Winchester has published a volume on *The Swiss Republic* (Lippincott), which is in the main a clear account of the origin, development, and actual working of its government. On this political side the volume will interest American readers, who will find it profitable to compare the Swiss and American ways of accomplishing the same end. The volume loses completeness by the addition of several chapters on such extraneous subjects as peasant-life, William Tell, and natural beauties and attractions. These immediately put it for judgment on a plane with works of a broader scope and deeper philosophy.——A series of volumes with an admirable purpose is that projected about the "Makers of America" (Dodd, Mead, & Co.), which is a title wide enough to include pioneers, statesmen, inventors, theologians, and generals. Other publishers have issued series which cover parts of this broad field; but the distinguishing mark of this series is that it deals only with men who have been of force great enough to actually give a trend to some phase of American life and thought. No man has a better right to a place in such a series than *General Houston*, whose biographer is Henry Bruce. His chief qualification for the work seems to have been a keen eye for what is most interesting about Houston in the works of Parton, Lester, and H. H. Bancroft. These extracts are put together with occasional ejaculations by the compiler, which are exhibitions of indifferent rhetoric and careless judgment.—A carefuller and more dignified biography is William Elliot Griffis's *Sir William Johnson*, which summarizes the career of the picturesque and forceful man who had a paramount influence in the making of the Mohawk Valley, and indeed in the colonial history of Central New York. Naturally the biography centres about Sir William's masterful management of the Indian question, and his personal influence with the Iroquois. The French and Indian War is the culminating historical event of the period with which Sir William had to do. Readers of Harold Frederic's romance of the Mohawk, "In the Valley," will be interested in this brief history of the epoch and scenes of that story.—A third volume of the series has a less dramatic but equally significant career for its subject,—that of *Thomas Hooker*, the Hartford (Conn.) preacher whose ideas and political teachings were embodied in the Connecticut Constitution of 1639, of which John Fiske has said, "It was the first written constitution known to history, that created a government, and it marked the beginnings of American Democracy, of which Thomas Hooker deserves, more than any other man, to be called the father." George Leon Walker has written this biography with painstaking research among the leading authorities and manuscripts not hitherto available. A bibliography of Hooker's published writings, compiled by J. H. Trum-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bull, is published in the appendix.——An interesting political period, and a group of men who played a prominent part in it, are portrayed in the *Life of Benjamin Harris Brewster* (Lippincott), by Eugene Coleman Savidge, M.D. Simon Cameron, James Buchanan, Eli K. Price, and George M. Dallas were the men with whom his early political life was associated, and he continued to be conspicuous in the politics of Pennsylvania and of the nation down to the days of President Arthur, whose attorney-general he was. This biography contains many interesting extracts from Mr. Brewster's speeches and letters, and really adds considerable to the public knowledge of a prominent man whose personality was always somewhat enigmatical.——In contrast with these records of the part taken by individual men in the making of America is Professor N. S. Shaler's scientific and philosophic study of the important influence of physical conditions on the development and history of our country. These collected essays are entitled *Nature and Man in America* (Scribner), and are invaluable to any student of the settlement and growth of the United States, or of its present and future economic problems. ——As a text-book for young people, Mary Sheldon Barnes and Earl Barnes have prepared *Studies in American History* (Heath), which aims to interest youthful scholars in the original sources of our history. Extracts from and references to more than four hundred volumes are given.——Charles Augustus Stoddard has written a pleasant narrative of rapid travel, entitled *Across Russia: from the Baltic to the Danube* (Scribner). The earlier chapters describe the journey from Paris, through Sweden and Finland, to Russia. The author's historical researches, illuminated by his recollections of sight-seeing, are grouped around the great Russian cities of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Warsaw, and Cracow. The volume closes with a glimpse of Hungary and the Carpathian Mountains.——One of the handsomest books of the season in illustration, typography, and binding, is the collected articles by Amelia Gere Mason, on *The Women of the French Salons* (Century Co.). During magazine publication, these articles won favor by the appreciation which they always exhibited for the finer and most feminine traits of these famous women; the author's avowed intention being "to gather within a limited compass the women who represented the social life of their time on its most intellectual side."——A very ingenuous and unliterary bit of American autobiography is the simple story of the life of Thomas Ball the sculptor, which he calls *My Threescore Years and Ten* (Roberts Bros.). It is a complacent and happy record, in which the writer's domesticity and piety are always present as inseparable from the idealism of his art.

FICTION.—Among the most interesting volumes of recent English fiction is J. Henry Shorthouse's *Blanche, Lady Falaise* (Macmillan). The dignity and refinement of the style, and the lofty sentiment, more than counteract the morbid theme. It is a very sad story, needlessly so, with a strong current of fatalism in it, tempered with piety. Why the plot of the first half of the volume should be condensed in a page or two of the introduction, and the reader fully let into the secret of what is to happen, is hard to explain either as literary art or artifice.——Frank R. Stockton has recently issued *The House of Martha* (Houghton) and *The Squirrel Inn* (Century Co.): the former a good example of his leisurely and placid humor; the latter, of his farcical method, and love of paradox. In these, as in all his stories, the char-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acters do not exhibit emotion or passion, they simply display benevolent impulses to eccentric actions.——In *The Faith Doctor* (Appleton), by Edward Eggleston, there is an incongruous mingling of practical charity, queer forms of religious sentiment, and amusing social aspirations and experiences.——Mrs. Cruger's *Vampires* and *Mademoiselle Réséda* (Lippincott) are social pictures of the artificial conditions which New York life produces. The scheme of *Vampires* is effective, and it is well worked out in the earlier and later chapters; but the middle of the book is an intrusion of life in high places, which does not belong to this story. *Mademoiselle Réséda* is not a pleasant tale, though nobody is very wicked. It leaves the impression that everybody would have been happier if they *had* been more wicked.——Good feeling and emotional force are the qualities of *Elsket, and Other Stories* (Scribner), by Thomas Nelson Page. The patient heroism of right sentiments is what appeals irresistibly to Mr. Page and his readers.——*With my Friends* (Longmans), by Brander Matthews and several collaborators, exhibits the art of story-making in partnership. They are very good tales, with the bones and articulations sometimes a little too much in evidence.——Mr. Howells publishes another farce, *The Albany Depot* (Harper), in which he abandons himself to fun of an obvious kind, and for the time forgets to be subtile.——Among recent translations of fiction are *The Countess Rudolstadt* (Dodd, Mead, & Co.), from the French of George Sand, by Frank H. Potter; Halévy's *A Marriage for Love* (Dodd), by the same translator, with elaborate illustrations by Wilson de Meza; *The Swan of Vilamorta* (Cassell), by Emilia Pardo Bazán, translated from the Spanish by Mary J. Serrano; *Asmodeus* (Worthington), from the French of Le Sage (illustrated by Tony Johannot); *The New Job* (Cassell), a tale of Galician peasant-life, from the German of Sacher Masoch, by Harriet L. Cohen; and *Tales of To-day* (Cassell), from the French of Musset, Gautier, Coppée, Bourget, and others, by E. P. Robins.——There is only space to mention a few of the best juvenile stories of the holiday season. Molly Elliot Seawell has told a wholesome and spirited tale of the War of 1812, which is entitled *Midshipman Paulding* (Appleton); Kirk Munroe writes a vigorous story of the oil regions, *Prince Dusty* (Putnam); and two of Henty's admirable boys' stories are published in this country (Scribner),—*Redskin and Cow-boy* (a tale of the Western plains), and *Held Fast for England* (a tale of the siege of Gibraltar).

POETRY.—*Two Worlds, and Other Poems* (Century Co.), by Richard Watson Gilder, is the product of refined poetic taste and a love of melody in words. The best poems are the lyrics, and there is more of Mr. Gilder's best quality in "The Star in the City" than in any other. The patriotic poems are perhaps the least successful.——At the other extreme of verse-writing are James Whitcomb Riley's *Neighborly Poems* (Bowen-Merrill Co.). Here the form is often ragged and the words uncouth, but the simplicity and the sincerity of sentiment make a direct appeal to the reader's sympathies.——Homely sentiments are also the basis of the later poems of Elizabeth Akers, gathered in a volume entitled *The High-Top Sweeting* (Scribner). This author's verses are painfully correct in form—page after page of excellent prosody with the strictest observance of all the conventions of verse-writing.——In a lighter vein are William Bard McVickar's *Lays of a Lawyer* (Allen & Co.), poems written in the manner of Locker and his descendants to the girl of the



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

period, who now as ever masquerades as "Phyllis" or "Chloe." They are clever and courteous, and recall the old days when it was expected of every gentleman that he should be able to write verses in his lady's album.——In a similar manner are Frank Chaffee's *Idle Verses Idly Writ* (Allen & Co.), which are not so felicitous as Mr. McVickar's, though fuller perhaps of "eyes of heavenly blue," "rosy lips," "sweet maids," "fair maids," and "kisses."——*Parnassus by Rail* (Putnam), by Marion Mills Miller, is a small volume in a pretentious manner. The affectation of classical wisdom and eccentric form cannot conceal the barrenness of poetic thought.——William Ernest Henley has made a selection of poems for boys, entitled *Lyra Heroica* (Scribner). From Shakspere to Kipling, he has chosen stirring ballads and lyrics which make their appeal to "the beauty and the joy of living, the beauty and the blessedness of death, the glory of battle and adventure, the nobility of devotion, the dignity of resistance, the sacred quality of patriotism." He has generally hit upon those poems which by rotund phrase, and swing of rhythm, particularly please the fancy of a vigorous boy.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Laurence Hutton's *Literary Landmarks of Edinburgh* (Harper) is an appreciative account of the associations of great names with obscure corners of the beautiful Scottish city. The author has searched scores of local histories and biographies, has talked with aged men who remember the faces and haunts of famous men, has made a personal examination of every locality or house to which he refers, and has "satisfied himself of the truth of every statement."——*Ocean Steamships* (Scribner) is in scope and treatment a companion volume to the valuable books from the same house on "The American Railway" and "Electricity in Daily Life." These three volumes give a popular account, by the highest authorities, of the great factors in the industrial and commercial life of this century. The Steamship volume, which contains nearly one hundred illustrations, is written by men of the authority and standing of Commander Chadwick, Lieuts. J. D. J. Kelley and Ridgely Hunt (U.S.N.); John H. Gould, late editor of "Ocean;" A. E. Seaton of Earle's Shipbuilding Co., England; and W. H. Rideing.——*Economic and Industrial Delusions* (Putnam) is a very modern discussion of the case for protection as viewed by a free-trader. The author, Arthur B. Farquhar, advances his views as "the experience-tested conclusions of a thoroughly practical business-man," and he re-enforces his statements with statistical and historical notes by his brother, Henry Farquhar.——Twelve *Essays on English Literature* (Scribner), by the French critic the late Edmond Scherer, have been translated by the English critic, George Saintsbury, and published with an introductory essay by him on M. Scherer's qualities and defects.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WRITERS AND SUBJECTS IN THE DECEMBER FORUM.

DEGRADATION BY PENSIONS—THE PROTEST OF LOYAL VOLUNTEERS. Lieutenant ALLEN R. FOOTE. Lieut. Allen Ripley Foote was born in Olcott, N. Y., in 1842, but when he was eight years old his family moved to Grand Rapids, Mich., where he received a common-school education. In 1861 he enlisted for three years in a Michigan regiment. Disabled by a wound at the battle of Fair Oaks in 1862, he was honorably discharged; but, having recovered, he again enlisted for three years in 1864, and served till the end of the war. Of late years he has studied electrical industries, and he has been special agent of the Census Bureau for the collection of statistics regarding such industries. Becoming deeply interested in the subject of pensions, he began an agitation for a change in the system, which led to the organization of "The Society of Loyal Volunteers." He is chairman of its National Board of Founders.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION. Governor WILLIAM E. RUSSELL. Governor William Eustis Russell was born in 1857, his father being Charles T. Russell, a Boston lawyer of eminence. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1877, studied law and began its practice. He soon manifested a lively interest in public affairs, and in 1885 was chosen mayor of his native city, Cambridge. He was twice re-elected, and attracted the attention of the State by the vigor and success with which he enforced the "no-license" policy regarding the liquor traffic in that city. His brilliant administration of the mayoralty led to his nomination for the governorship of 1888 by the Democrats, who have made him their candidate each year since. He was defeated in 1888 and 1889, although running ahead of his ticket; but in 1890 he was elected, and last month he was re-elected on a largely increased vote, while every other candidate on the Democratic ticket was beaten.

THE JEWISH PERSECUTION—ITS FINANCIAL AND INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS. A. LEROY-BEAULIEU. M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu was born in Lisieux in 1842, and first attracted notice in the literary world by a volume of poems published in 1865. He afterwards wrote several works on art, but finally devoted himself to political science. He is a member of the French Institute, and professor of contemporary history in the *École libre des sciences politiques*. He is especially qualified to write upon Russian subjects by a long residence in that country, one fruit of which was his "*L'Empire des Tsars et les Russes*" (1881–89.)

FRENCH FEELING TOWARDS GERMANY. CAMILLE PELLETAN. M. Charles-Camille Pelletan was born in Paris in 1846, and won distinction as a student. After completing his education, he engaged in journalism, and suffered a month's imprisonment for one of his political articles. After the war of 1870 he entered the Assembly. In 1880 he became editor-in-chief of *La Justice*, a radical journal. He has also contributed to other journals, and has published several books. He is a member of the Chamber of Deputies, and is exceptionally well qualified to interpret the feeling of the French people towards Germany.

SHOULD THE SILVER LAW OF 1890 BE REPEALED? JACOB H. SCHIFF. Mr. Jacob H. Schiff is an active member of the well-known New York banking-house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. He is distinguished for his generous gifts to good causes of every sort, and for his clear judgment regarding business questions. He has taken a prominent part in the discussions of the silver question before the N. Y. Chamber of Commerce.

A PLAN FOR A PERMANENT BANK SYSTEM. HORACE WHITE. Mr. Horace White was born in Colebrook, N. H., in 1834, but his family soon removed to Wisconsin, and he graduated at Beloit College in 1853. He was for many years connected with the Chicago *Tribune*, and from 1864 to 1874 was its editor-in-chief. In 1881 he became one of the editors of "The New York Evening Post." He has long paid especial attention to financial subjects.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BANK-NOTE CIRCULATION—MR. HARTER'S PLAN. H. W. CANNON. Mr. Henry White Cannon was born at Delhi, N. Y., in 1850, and in boyhood became clerk in a national bank there. In 1870 he removed to Minnesota, and in 1871 organized a national bank at Stillwater, of which he was made cashier. In 1884 he was appointed Comptroller of the Currency, which office he resigned in 1886 to re-enter the banking business, in New York. He is president of the Chase National Bank, a member of the Clearing-House Committee, and one of the Aqueduct Commissioners. As Comptroller and as bank officer, he has enjoyed unusual facilities for making a thorough study of all banking problems.

IS MODERN EDUCATION A FAILURE? FREDERIC HARRISON. Mr. Frederic Harrison was born in London in 1831, attended Kings College School, and was elected to a fellowship at Wadham College, Oxford. He became a lawyer, and devoted himself to the study of equity, international law, and social questions. In 1877 he was appointed professor of jurisprudence and international law by the Council of Legal Education. He has published many political and religious essays, and is one of the greatest living masters of English prose style.

REFORMATORY OR PUNITIVE PRISON MANAGEMENT? ELIJAH C. FOSTER. Mr. Elijah C. Foster was born in Ontario in 1842, but his family removed to Michigan when he was quite young, and he graduated from the law department of the State University in 1868. He practised his profession in Iowa, and in 1889 was appointed special agent of the Department of Justice at Washington. In this capacity he supervises the accounts of Federal Court officials and commissioners, and has the care and treatment of all United States prisoners.

UNREGULATED COMPETITION SELF-DESTRUCTIVE. ALDACE F. WALKER. Mr. Aldace F. Walker was born in Vermont, rose to the colonelcy of a regiment from that State during the war, and upon his return became a prominent lawyer. He served in the Legislature, and gave special attention to the railroad problems before it. In 1887 he was appointed by President Cleveland one of the Interstate Commerce Commission and he served with credit until he resigned to accept the chairmanship of the Commissioners of the Western Traffic Association. He is regarded as one of the keenest students of railroad problems in the country. He contributed an article on the interstate commerce law to THE FORUM for July, 1891.

THE WORK OF WOMEN'S CLUBS. ALICE H. RHINE. Mrs. Alice H. Rhine was born in Philadelphia in 1840. She has written much prose and verse for the periodical press. She contributed an article on "Race Prejudice at Summer Resorts" to THE FORUM for July, 1887.

NEED SCHOOL BE A BLIGHT TO CHILD-LIFE? DR. J. M. RICE. Dr. J. M. Rice was born in Philadelphia in 1857. He attended the College of the City of New York, and was graduated from the College of Physicians and Surgeons in the same city in 1881. He practised his profession until 1888, and then resolved to devote himself to the study of the mental and physical development of children. For this purpose he went abroad and took a course in psychology and pedagogy at the universities of Jena and Leipzig, after which he visited the schools of various European countries. He returned to America about a year ago, and devotes his time to lecturing and writing on the subjects of his studies.

A DAY WITH LORD TENNYSON. SIR EDWIN ARNOLD. Sir Edwin Arnold was born in England in 1832, and was graduated at Oxford in 1854 after having won the Newdigate prize. He became principal of the government Sanscrit School at Poona, India, but resigned in 1861, and returned to England. He became connected with the London *Daily Telegraph*, and served for many years as its editor, his political articles attracting much attention. But he is best known to the public as a poet, "The Light of Asia" and "The Light of the World" having won him great popularity. He is now on a tour of this country reading selections from his poems.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED